Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
94 1976 JUN 2 1995
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. ____

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1994

LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA,
Petitioner,

v.

STATE OF ALASKA,
Respondent,

v.

BRUCE BABBITT, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR
Respondent.

On Petition For a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals For the Ninth Circuit

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Leonard Garment
Joseph J. Aronica
Counsel of Record for Petitioner
Edith Eisner Albert
Mark A. Simko
Mudge Rose Guthrie
Alexander & Ferdon
1200 - 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 973-1200

June 2, 1995

Balmar Legal Publishing Department, Washington, D.C. (202) 682-9800

126pp

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether a State Legislature has Article III standing to protect its own legislative authority granted to it by the State Constitution and the Statehood Compact if the State Executive Branch refuses to defend that authority from preemption by a federal agency.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
QUESTION PRESENTED	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	v
OPINION BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	2
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTES	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	3
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION	8
I. PETITIONER HAS STANDING TO INTERVENE	9
A. The Petitioner Will Be Directly Injured If The Regulations Promulgated By The Secretary Go Into Effect	10
B. The Petitioner's Injury Is Directly Caused By The Challenged Action	13
C. Redressibility: The Court Could Resolve the Issue of the Secretary's Authority	13
D. The Petitioner Has Met the Four Criteria for Intervention Under Rule 24 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure	14

TABLE OF CONTENTS — Continued

PAGE

II. THE NINTH CIRCUIT'S RULING IS IN CONFLICT WITH THIS COURT'S PRECEDENT AND THAT OF THE OTHER CIRCUITS 16

A. The Holding That A Potential Intervenor Must Demonstrate That It Is "Empowered Under State Law" To Intervene Impermissibly Restricts Access to the Federal Courts By Expanding The Requirements of Article III (Standing) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 24 (Intervention). 18

B. The Petitioner Has Demonstrated That It Is Not Prohibited Under State Law From Challenging The Secretary's Regulations 20

III. EXCEPTIONAL IMPORTANCE OF THE UNDERLYING ISSUES 21

A. The District Court Opinion Has Placed The Sovereignty of the State of Alaska In Jeopardy 21

TABLE OF CONTENTS — Continued

PAGE

1. Violation of Federal Law — The Petitioner's Exclusive Right to Manage Fish and Wildlife on Public Lands Is Guaranteed by the Alaska Statehood Act and Compact and the Alaska State Constitution, Both Of Which Are Congressionally Ratified 22
2. ANILCA's Plain Language Prohibits Federal Usurpation of the Petitioner's Authority 22
3. The District Court Opinion Permits The Head of An Agency To Make a Self-Determination of Authority Despite Clear Statutory Language to the Contrary and Impermissibly Expands Agency Discretion Under Chevron 24

B. Resolution of These Issues is Urgent 25

IV. CONCLUSION 28

TABLE GF AUTHORITIES

CASES	PAGES
Adams Fruit Co. v. Barrett, 494 U.S. 638 (1990)	24
Allen v. Wright, 468 U.S. 737 (1984).	9
American Brake Shoe & Foundry Co. v. Interborough Rapid Transit Co., 3 F.R.D. 162 (S.D.N.Y. 1942)	14
Ameron, Inc. v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 787 F.2d 875 (3rd Cir. 1986), *cert. dismissed*, 488 U.S. 918 (1988)	17
Arizona v. California, 460 U.S. 605 (1983)	14
BFP v. Resolution Trust Corp., ____ U.S. ____, 114 S.Ct. 1757 (1994)	23
Barnes v. Kline, 759 F.2d 21 (D.C. Cir. 1984), *vacated as moot, Burke v. Barnes*, 479 U.S. 361 (1987)	17, 19
Beecher v. Wetherby, 95 U.S. 517 (1877)	25
Bowen v. Georgetown University Hosp., 488 U.S. 204 (1988)	24
California v. ARC America Corp., 490 U.S. 93 (1989)	22, 24
Chevron USA v. Natural Resources Defense Council, 467 U.S. 837 (1984)	24
Chiles v. Thornburgh, 865 F.2d 1197 (11th Cir. 1989)	16, 17
Coleman v. Miller, 307 U.S. 433 (1939)	11, 12
Defenders of Wildlife v. Andrus, 627 F.2d 1238 (D.C. Cir. 1980)	22
Dennis v. Luis, 741 F.2d 628 (3rd Cir. 1984)	17, 19
Diamond v. Charles, 476 U.S. 54 (1986)	14, 16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES — Continued

	PAGES
Didrickson v. U.S. Dep't of Interior, 982 F.2d 1332 (9th Cir. 1992)	14
Duke Power Co. v. Carolina Environmental Study Group, 438 U.S. 59 (1978)	19
First United Methodist Church of Hyattsville v. U.S. Gypsum Co., 882 F.2d 862 (4th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 493 U.S. 1070 (1990)	21
Garcia v. San Antonio Metro Transit Auth., 467 U.S. 528 (1985)	26
Gibraltar Financial Corp. of Cal. v. United States, 825 F.2d 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	21
Gregory v. Ashcroft, 501 U.S. 452 (1991)	26
Hubbard v. United States, ___ U.S. ___, 63 U.S.L.W. 4393 (May 16, 1995)	15
INS v. Chadha, 462 U.S. 919 (1983)	12, 20
Idaho v. Freeman, 529 F. Supp. 1107 (D. Idaho 1981), *vacated as moot, NOW, Inc. v. Idaho*, 459 U.S. 809 (1982)	12
Karcher v. May, 484 U.S. 72 (1987)	12
Kennedy v. Sampson, 511 F.2d 430 (D.C. Cir. 1974)	17, 19
Kleppe v. New Mexico, 426 U.S. 529 (1976)	21, 24
Korioth v. Briscoe, 523 F.2d 1271 (5th Cir. 1975)	17, 19
Landreth Timber Co. v. Landreth, 731 F.2d 1348 (9th Cir. 1984), *rev'd on other grounds*, 471 U.S. 681 (1985)	14
Los Angeles v. Lyons, 461 U.S. 95 (1983)	9
Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, et al., 504 U.S. 555 (1992)	9, 10, 19

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES — Continued

PAGES

McDowell v. State of Alaska, 785 P.2d 1 (Alaska 1989) 5

Metcalf v. National Petroleum Council, 553 F.2d 176 (D.C. Cir. 1977) 20

Moore v. U.S. House of Rep., 733 F.2d 946 (D.C. Cir. 1984), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 1106 (1985) . 17, 19

Mountain States Legal Foundation v. Costle, 630 F.2d 754 (10th Cir. 1980), *cert. denied*, 450 U.S. 1050 (1981) 17

New York v. United States, 505 U.S. 144 (1992) . . . 26

Pellegrino v. Nesbit, 203 F.2d 463 (9th Cir. 1953) . . 14

Rice v. Santa Fe Elevator Corp., 331 U.S. 218 (1947) 22

Russello v. United States, 464 U.S. 16 (1983) 23

Sagebrush Rebellion, Inc. v. Watt, 713 F.2d 525 (9th Cir. 1983) 14, 15

Schultz v. Williams, 44 F.3d 48, 52-53 (2d Cir. 1994) 14

Sierra Club v. Morton, 405 U.S. 727 (1972) 9

Silver v. Jordan, 241 F. Supp. 576 (S.D. Cal. 1964), *aff'd*, 381 U.S. 415 (1965) 13, 18

Simon v. Easter Ky. Welfare Rights Org., 426 U.S. 26 (1976) 9

Sixty-Seventh Minnesota State Senate v. Beens, 406 U.S. 187 (1977) 13, 18, 20

State of Alaska v. Babbitt, ___ F.3d ____, 1995 WL 231341, (9th Cir. (Alaska)) 2

Stearns v. Minnesota, 179 U.S. 223 (1900) 25

Texas v. Pullman, 312 U.S. 496 (1941) 21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES — Continued

PAGES

Trbovich v. United Mine Workers of America, 404 U.S. 528 (1972) 16

U.S. South Florida Water Management District, 922 F.2d 704 (11th Cir.), *cert. denied, West Palm Beach County Farm Bureau v. United States*, 502 U.S. 953 (1991) 15, 16

United Airlines, Inc. v. McDonald, 432 U.S. 385 (1977) 14

United States v. Espinoza-Leon, 873 F.2d 743 (4th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 924 (1989) 23

United States v. Lopez, ___ U.S. ___, 115 S. Ct. 1624 (1995) 9, 11, 22

United States v. Maine, 420 U.S. 515 (1975) 15

Warth v. Seldin, 422 U.S. 490 (1975) 9

Warwick v. State ex rel Chance, 548 P.2d 384 (Alaska 1976) 21

Washington State Building & Construction Trades v. Spellman, 684 F.2d 627 (9th Cir. 1982), *cert. denied, Don't Waste Washington Legal Defense Foundation v. Washington*, 461 U.S. 913 (1983) 15

Whitmore v. Arkansas, 494 U.S. 149 (1990) 9

Yniguez v. State of Arizona, 939 F.2d 727 (9th Cir. 1991) 14, 15, 16, 17

Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer, 343 U.S. 579 (1952) 25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES — Continued

PAGES

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTES

U.S. Const., Art. III 2

Alaska Const., Art. III, Section 16 21

Alaska Const., Art. VIII 2

Alaska Const., Art. VIII, Section 2 11

Alaska Const., Art. VIII, Section 5 11

Alaska Const., Art. VIII, Section 6 11

Alaska Const., Art. VIII, Section 8 11

Alaska Const., Art. VIII, Section 9 11

Alaska Const., Art. VIII, Section 12 11

Alaska Const., Art. VIII, Section 14 11

Alaska Const., Art. VIII, Section 15 11

Alaska Statehood Act and Compact, Act of July 7, 1958, Pub. L. 85-508, 72 Stat. 339 (1958) . . . 2, 10

Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act ("ANILCA"), Pub. L. No. 96-487, 94 Stat., 2374 (1980), 16 U.S.C. § 3101 *et seq* 2

16 U.S.C. § 3102 . . . . . 3, 4

16 U.S.C. § 3115 23

16 U.S.C. § 3118 23

16 U.S.C. § 3202 . . . . . 5, 23

28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) 2

28 U.S.C. § 1292 . . . . . 2, 6

Alaska Statutes, Section 24.20.060 . . . . . 20, 21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES — Continued

PAGES

RULES AND REGULATIONS

55 Fed. Reg. 27,114 (June 29, 1990) 2, 6

57 Fed. Reg. 22,940 (May 29, 1992) 2, 3, 10

Fed. R. Civ. P. 24 14

Alaska R. App. P. 407 21

No. ____

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1994

LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA,
Petitioner,

v.

STATE OF ALASKA,
Respondent,

v.

BRUCE BABBITT, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR
Respondent.

On Petition For a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals For the Ninth Circuit

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

The Legislature of the State of Alaska ("Petitioner") petitions for a writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit to review its order denying intervention in this case.[1]

OPINION BELOW

The Order of the court of appeals denying intervention and the dismissal of the challenge to the authority of the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture (A-1)[2] and the Amended Order (A-3) are unreported. The Order of the court of appeals denying the

[1] In addition to the parties set forth in the above caption, the Native American Rights Fund was a party to the proceeding in the Ninth Circuit.

[2] References to the Appendix in this booklet are "A" followed by the page number; thusly "A-1."

motion for a rehearing, with a suggestion for a rehearing *en banc*, or in the alternative, a motion to reconsider (A-5) is unreported. The decision of the Court of Appeals on the continued appeal noting the denial of the motion to intervene (A-54) is reported at ___ F.3d ___ (9th Cir. 1995), 1995 WL 231341 (9th Cir. (Alaska)).[3]

JURISDICTION

The Order of the court of appeals was entered on February 7, 1995. A-1. A timely petition for rehearing, with a suggestion for a rehearing *en banc* or in the alternative a motion for reconsideration was denied on March 7, 1995. A-5. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTES

United States Constitution, Article III (A-74); Constitution of the State of Alaska, Article VIII (A-80); Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act ("ANILCA"), Pub. L. No. 96-487, 94 Stat, 2374 (1980), 16 U.S.C. § 3101 *et seq.* (A-76); Alaska Statehood Act and Compact, Act of July 7, 1958, Pub. L. 85-508, 72 Stat. 339 (1958)(A-75); Temporary Subsistance Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska, 55 Fed. Reg. 27,114 (June 29, 1990); Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska, 57 Fed. Reg. 22,940 (May 29, 1992)(A-78).

---

[3] The Alaska Legislature, angry with the Governor's directive to the Attorney General to stipulate to the dismissal, filed an emergency motion for intervention and, in the alternative, for substitution, or for stay. *We denied its motion, concluding that the Legislature was not empowered under state law to intervene in the appeal. In light of the dismissal with prejudice of that issue, the district court's holding on this issue stands.*

State of Alaska v. Babbitt, ___ F.3d ___, 1995 WL 231341, 5 n.2 (9th Cir. (Alaska)) (emphasis added) A-55-56.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This case raises the fundamental issue of the Petitioner's standing under Article III of the United States Constitution to defend its own rights under the Alaska Constitution and Alaska Statehood Act and Compact to regulate the natural resources of the State from preemption by the *ultra vires* actions of the federal Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter "Secretary").[4]

The exceptional importance of this case presents a compelling basis for certiorari. First, the opinion effectively overrules this Court's Article III standing doctrine by requiring a litigant to show something more than Article III standing (state law "empowerment") to seek redress in federal court. *See infra* at 9-16. This, in turn, raises significant "separation of powers" issues by sanctioning a federal court's abrogation of its constitutional duty to hear all "cases" and "controversies" properly before it under Article III. *See infra* at 18-20. Second, the opinion ignores this Court's clear precedent, and creates a Circuit split regarding the proper test for "legislative standing." *See infra* at 16-21. Third, the opinion clouds the proper interplay between Article III standing and the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 24 in determining the appropriateness of intervention. *See infra* at 16.

The underlying decision of the United States District Court for Alaska (Honorable H. Russell Holland, C.J.) in *State v. Babbitt*, March 30, 1994, (A-12) approves a major encroachment of federal authority into an area traditionally reserved to the State of Alaska's management. The district court held that the Secretary has the authority to regulate the taking of fish and

---

[4] The Secretary of Agriculture has jurisdiction over the national forests while the Secretary of Interior has jurisdiction over all remaining public lands in Alaska. ANILCA, Section 102, 16 U.S.C. § 3102.

wildlife on public lands[5] and navigable waters on those lands despite the explicit acknowledgement by the court that Congress enacted no provision in ANILCA which explicitly gave the Secretary any such authority.

On April 14, 1994, the Attorney General of Alaska filed a petition for interlocutory appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On January 23, 1995, after the case was fully briefed to the court of appeals, the Governor of Alaska announced that he would direct the dismissal of the issue challenging the authority of the Secretary to manage the natural resources on the public lands.[6] By this action, the Governor effectively allowed, pursuant to the district court's decision, for the preemption by the Secretary of the authority of the Petitioner to manage these resources.

Petitioner acted immediately. On January 24, 1995, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House wrote to the Governor urging him not to dismiss the issue challenging the Secretary's authority. A-65. On January 25, 1995, Petitioner wrote to the court of appeals to advise it that it opposed the dismissal of the issue and that it would seek to intervene in the case. A-66. On January 25, 1995, a Resolution (A-70) was introduced in both Houses of the Petitioner and was passed by overwhelming majorities on January 26, in the Senate and on January 30, 1995 in the House. The Resolution strongly urged

---

[5] Public lands is defined as federal land located in Alaska, with several exceptions. 16 U.S.C. 3102 (3).

[6] The Attorney General continued to press the issue that the district court erred in holding that Congress intended navigable waters to constitute "public lands" under ANILCA. That issue was decided by the court of appeals on April 20, 1995. A-54. If the court of appeals had determined in this case that the Secretary had no authority to regulate the natural resources, then the navigable servitude controversy would have been eliminated.

the Governor not to dismiss the issue and stressed that if he did, Petitioner would seek to intervene in the case to press it.

On January 27, 1995, pursuant to its Resolution, Petitioner filed an emergency motion for leave to intervene or, in the alternative, for substitution, or in the alternative, for stay. On February 7, 1995, the court of appeals denied Petitioner's motion,[7] (A-1) and on March 7, 1995, the Petitioner's timely motion for reconsideration and petition for a rehearing were denied and the suggestion for a rehearing *en banc* was rejected. A-5.

In Title VIII of ANILCA, Congress required the establishment of a rural subsistence preference for fishing and hunting on the public lands in Alaska. At the same time, Congress recognized the inherent authority of the state with respect to the management of its fish and wildlife by declaring that nothing in ANILCA is intended to amend the Alaska Constitution or enlarge or diminish the responsibility and authority of the Secretary for management of fish and wildlife on the public lands. ANILCA Sections 1314(a) and (b), 16 U.S.C. § 3202.

Anticipating ANILCA's enactment, Petitioner passed a statute of general applicability providing for a rural preference which was found by the Secretary to conform to the Title VIII preference. However, in *McDowell v. State of Alaska*, 785 P.2d 1 (Alaska 1989), the Alaska Supreme Court held that the statute violated the Alaska Constitution which prohibits special privileges to any group, and guarantees instead that the resources of the State be available to all its citizens equally.

As the result of *McDowell*, there was not and could not be an Alaska statute which granted a rural preference consistent with ANILCA Title VIII *and* the Alaska Constitution. Therefore, with regard to Alaska, the Secretary promulgated regulations which mandated a rural preference and created the Federal

---

[7] Contrary to the implication in the Ninth Circuit Opinion (A-55-56, n.2), the Stipulation of Dismissal was not entered until *after* the Petitioner's emergency motion to intervene was denied.

Subsistence Board to manage subsistence hunting and fishing on the public lands. 55 Fed. Reg. 27,114 (June 29, 1990).

The State filed suit against the United States, claiming that the Secretary's regulations usurped Alaska's (the Petitioner's) authority to manage fish and wildlife resources on the federal public lands notwithstanding the lack of explicit authorization by Congress in ANILCA granting the Secretary such authority. The State alleged that the regulations were in derogation of its sovereignty as recognized in ANILCA, as guaranteed and codified in the Alaska Statehood Act and Compact, and as set forth in the Alaska Constitution. The State sought declaratory and injunctive relief to regain management and control of the fish and wildlife on the federal public lands as well as the navigable and certain nonnavigable waters of the State.

On March 30, 1994, the Alaska District Court ruled that the Secretary was authorized to regulate the taking of fish and wildlife for subsistence purposes on the public lands in Alaska. The court did so despite the fact that it found that "Congress has simply not enacted any express, direct authorization that the Secretary implement the rural preference and subsistence priority if the State does not do so." A-25. The court concluded that "Congress unintentionally and inadvertently omitted an express provision authorizing the Secretary to implement the subsistence priority." A-26. Simultaneously, the district court issued a sixty day stay of its decision, invited the parties to take an interlocutory appeal pursuant to Title 28, U.S.C. § 1292(b) and stayed litigation in a number of other similar cases.

By inviting an interlocutory appeal, the court recognized that its holding would,

> entail a major disruption of the management of fish in Alaska for subsistence purposes. It would be naive of the Court to think that this decision will be well received by either State or Federal authorities for each have seemingly been quite satisfied with the *status*

> *quo*. It would not be surprising if both the State and the Federal Government would desire to seek review of the Court's decision.

Order, March 30, 1994; A-7.

As to the importance of this issue, the court recognized that if its decision,

> is not correct, any further action that this court might take in implementing Title VIII of ANILCA would be fundamentally and irreparably flawed. It would be a tremendous, tragic waste of the time and money of Federal regulators if the Courts were to mistakenly require that they assume responsibility for the management of fish for subsistence purposes in the navigable waters of the State of Alaska.
>
> . . .
>
> Indeed, if the court's holding on either of the foregoing issues is wrong, the plaintiffs [Katie John and others] will, for all practical purposes have to pursue their subsistence fishing rights first before state regulators and then in state courts, not this federal court.
>
> . . .
>
> In short, it is vital to the subsistence fishing programs of both the State of Alaska and the federal government that the court and parties have an early, final decision.

Id.; A-8.

The court suggested that the following was a controlling question of law as to which a party might seek interlocutory review:

> Does [ANILCA] fail to empower the Secretaries of the Departments of Interior and Agriculture to implement Title VIII of ANILCA under circumstances where, as here, the state had once qualified . . . to

> manage fish in Alaska for subsistence purposes by virtue of having adopted a law of general application consistent with Title VIII of ANILCA?

Id.; A-7.

This is the underlying substantive issue (*i.e.*, the proprietary of the Secretary's establishment of the Federal Subsistence Board, promulgation of regulations establishing a rural hunting and fishing preference under ANILCA and the management of those resources) which the Petitioner sought to press before the court of appeals through intervention.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

This case raises an issue of exceptional importance — the appropriate Article III standing requirement of a state legislature to seek access to the federal courts in order to protect its legislative authority from preemption by federal agencies. While there are cases which address Article III standing in general and others pertaining to legislative litigants, there is none which places an additional hurdle — authorization or empowerment under state law — before redress can be sought in federal court.

The court of appeals' denial of the Petitioner's intervention in this case is fundamentally flawed in two respects. First, as a threshold matter, Petitioner has Article III standing to intervene under the standard enunciated by this Court and followed by other courts of appeals. Second, the court of appeals cannot restrict access to the federal courts by adding a requirement that a litigant show affirmative "empowerment" or authorization under state law. The addition of this empowerment requirement will greatly limit the freedom of redress in the federal system guaranteed under Article III of the Constitution.

In addition, the substantive issue which the Petitioner seeks to press — the expansion of authority by the federal government into an area traditionally reserved to the States, without any explicit delegation by Congress, is significant and recurring.

E.g., United States v. Lopez, ___ U.S. ___, 115 S. Ct. 1624 (1995). Here, the federal preemption of Petitioner's legislative function was not effected by an explicit delegation of authority to the Secretary by Congress in ANILCA. Instead, the district court found that the Secretary had general authority to act which enabled him to fill in a "gap" left by Congress.

I. PETITIONER HAS STANDING TO INTERVENE

The Petitioner has Article III standing to intervene because it will sustain a direct, concrete, injury as a result of the Secretary's regulations and because such injury is capable of immediate redress by the court. *E.g., Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, et al.*, 504 U.S. 555, 560-561 (1992). The traditional Article III standing test requires the Petitioner to demonstrate: (1) that it suffered an "injury in fact" — an invasion of a legally protected interest which is concrete and particularized[8] and "actual or imminent, not 'conjectural' or 'hypothetical'";[9] (2) that the causal connection between the injury and the conduct complained of is "fairly ... trace[able] to the challenged action of the defendant, and not ... th[e] result [of] the independent action of some third party not before the court;"[10] and (3) that it is "likely," as opposed to merely "speculative," that the injury will be "redressed by a favorable decision."[11] For purposes of this Court's analysis, the Petitioner's allegations supporting Article III standing must be considered true. *Warth v. Seldin*, 422 U.S. 490, 501 (1975).

---

[8] *Lujan*, 504 U.S. at 560, *citing Allen v. Wright*, 468 U.S. 737, 756 (1984); *Warth v. Seldin*, 422 U.S. 490, 508 (1975); *Sierra Club v. Morton*, 405 U.S. 727, 740-741, n.16 (1972).

[9] *Lujan*, 504 U.S. at 560, *quoting Whitmore v. Ark.*, 494 U.S. 149, 155 (1990) and *Los Angeles v. Lyons*, 461 U.S. 95, 102 (1983).

[10] *Lujan*, 504 U.S. at 560-561, *quoting Simon v. Eastern Ky. Welfare Rights Org.*, 426 U.S. 26, 41-42 (1976).

[11] *Simon*, 426 U.S. at 38, 43.

A. The Petitioner Will Be Directly Injured If The Regulations Promulgated By The Secretary Go Into Effect.

The Petitioner will be directly injured by the Secretary's regulations. The injury is immediate, particularized and distinct from that which would be sustained by the citizens of the State who would be subject to the rural preference.

Because the Petitioner was unable to pass legislation consistent with ANILCA Title VIII *and* the Alaska Constitution, the Secretary promulgated regulations providing for a rural preference and creating a Federal Subsistence Board to manage fish and wildlife on public lands in Alaska.

The Secretary intended by its regulations and by the creation of the Board to divest management of the federal public lands from the Petitioner.[12] This Court has noted that where, as here, the Petitioner is "an object of the action" at issue, "there is ordinarily little question that the action . . . has caused him injury, and that a judgment preventing . . . the action will redress it." *Lujan*, 504 U.S. at 560-562.

In addition to the Petitioner being an object of this action, the Secretary's action deprives the Petitioner of its right to vote and to legislate in this area, even though Petitioner is specifically empowered to do so pursuant to the Alaska Constitution and the Alaska Statehood Act and Compact.[13] As part of the statehood

---

[12] Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska, 57 Fed. Reg. 22,940 (May 29, 1992); A-78-79.

[13] The issue of which party would manage Alaska's public lands was of central importance to both sovereigns involved in authorizing the Compact (the Compact is a bilateral agreement between Alaska, in its sovereign capacity as a representative of its citizens, and the United States) whereby Alaska became a state. The federal government and the State explicitly agreed as part of the Compact that once the State had established a mechanism to manage the public lands that management would be ceded by the federal authorities to the State. Alaska Statehood Act and Compact, Pub. L. No. 85-508, 72 Stat. 339, 341 (July 7, 1958); A-75. Management was ceded to the Petitioner in 1960 pursuant to this agreement.

process, Congress approved, before Alaska's admission to the Union, Alaska's Constitution. The Alaska Constitution includes provisions which specifically empower Petitioner both to legislate and to regulate the use and allocation of Alaska's natural resources. A80-83. Article VIII, Section 2, entitled "General Authority," provides:

> The [Petitioner] shall provide for the utilization, development, and conservation of all natural resources belonging to the State, including land and waters, for the maximum benefit of its people.

Other Sections of Article VIII confirm and expand upon Petitioner's authority to legislate/regulate in this area. Section 5 states that Petitioner may provide for facilities, improvements and services to assure greater utilization, development, reclamation, and settlement of lands and assure the fuller utilization and development of the fisheries, wildlife and waters. Section 6 requires Petitioner to provide for the selection of lands granted to the State by the United States, and for the administration of the State public domain.[14] Thus, Petitioner has been given express authority under the State Constitution and the Statehood Compact to perform the very management and oversight functions which the Secretary's regulations purport to assume on behalf of the federal government.[15]

This Court has long recognized with regard to an individual legislator, a group of individual legislators, one house of a legislature or the entire legislature, that impairment of or nullification of the right to legislate and/or vote will be a direct injury for purposes of Article III standing. *Coleman v. Miller*, 307 U.S.

---

[14] *See also* Alaska Constitution, Article VIII, Sections 8, 9, 12, 14, and 15. Taken together, these Sections demonstrate a comprehensive authority and direction to the Petitioner to regulate Alaska's natural resources. A80-83.

[15] This Court has granted certiorari in cases where, as here, a state's rights/powers are arguably invaded by the federal government. *E.g.*, *United States v. Lopez*, ___ U.S. ___, 115 S. Ct. 1624 (1995).

433, 438 (1939) (plaintiff had a protected interest in vindicating his vote).[16] *See also Idaho v. Freeman*, 529 F. Supp. 1107 (D. Idaho 1981), *vacated as moot, NOW, Inc. v. Idaho*, 459 U.S. 809 (1982).

This Court followed *Coleman* in *Karcher v. May*, 484 U.S. 72 (1987). In that case, this Court held that individual legislators, who intervened on behalf of the entire state legislature, could not continue the lawsuit in their *individual* capacities after they left office.[17] However, in so holding, this Court clearly indicated that jurisdiction had been proper in the district court and the court of appeals so long as the legislators held office, notwithstanding the fact that the Attorney General had declined to defend the suit. As Justice White pointed out in his concurrence, by allowing the legislature to intervene to defend the suit when the state executive did not wish to assert the statute's constitutionality, this Court "acknowledged that the New Jersey Legislature and its authorized representative have the authority to defend the constitutionality of a statute attacked in federal court." *Id.* at 84. Thus, a state legislature has a protected interest in defending its legislation. *See also INS v. Chadha*, 462 U.S. 919, 939 (1983) (holding that Congress was the proper party to defend the constitutionality of a federal statute).

There is no principled difference between cases where a legislature defends its legislation from a third-party challenge and cases where a third-party takes an action which infringes upon a legislature's ability to legislate, as in this case. This Court has held that state legislatures have Article III standing where the

---

[16] *Coleman* held that twenty state senators who voted against ratification of a federal constitutional amendment had standing to challenge the state lieutenant governor's legal authority to cast the deciding vote in favor of the amendment.

[17] This aspect of the holding is inapplicable here, since the motion to intervene was made on behalf of the Petitioner and not legislators acting as individuals.

state constitution provided the legislature with the authority to vote/legislate in an area and where the challenged action deprived it of that right. For example, in both *Silver v. Jordan*, 241 F. Supp. 576 (S.D. Cal. 1964), *aff'd*, 381 U.S. 415 (1965) and *Sixty-Seventh Minnesota State Senate v. Beens*, 406 U.S. 187, 194 (1977), the state senates were permitted to intervene in lawsuits challenging apportionment. This Court found that the senates had standing to protect their unique interest — their ability to legislate concerning reapportionment, an ability provided to them by their state constitutions.[18] Similarly, here, the Alaska State Constitution allocates to the Petitioner the right to legislate with regard to the management of fish and wildlife in Alaska.

B. The Petitioner's Injury Is Directly Caused By The Challenged Action.

ANILCA does not (by itself) create a federal authority which preempts the Petitioner's ability to legislate in this area. Instead, the Secretary unilaterally and with no statutory basis, took the affirmative action of promulgating the regulations at issue and creating the Federal Subsistence Board to manage fish and wildlife resources. In the absence of such action, Petitioner would not be injured.

C. Redressibility: The Court Could Resolve the Issue of the Secretary's Authority.

Given that the challenged regulations preempt and supersede the Petitioner's legislative function, if the regulations are stricken the Petitioner will have succeeded in restoring its ability to legislate with regard to the management of fish and wildlife on public lands.

---

[18] *Sixty Seven Minnesota*, 406 U.S. at 195, n.7 and 196; *Silver*, 241 F. Supp. at 578.

D. The Petitioner Has Met the Four Criteria for Intervention Under Rule 24 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.[19]

The Petitioner has also met the four criteria for intervention under Fed. R. Civ. P. 24, as discussed in *Sagebrush Rebellion, Inc. v. Watt*, 713 F.2d 525 (9th Cir. 1983).[20] These criteria are: (1) timeliness; (2) interest in the subject matter of the litigation; (3) absent intervention the party's interest may be practically impaired; and (4) other parties inadequately represent the inter-

---

[19] This case presents exceptional circumstances (*supra* at 4-5) pursuant to which a court has the authority to grant intervention at the appellate level. *E.g., United Airlines, Inc. v. McDonald*, 432 U.S. 385, 395, n.16 (1977), *citing, American Brake Shoe & Foundry Co. v. Interborough Rapid Transit Co.*, 3 F.R.D. 162 (S.D.N.Y. 1942) (permitting intervention after party representing intervenor-applicant's interests abandoned appeal); *Yniguez v. State of Arizona*, 939 F.2d 727, 740 (9th Cir. 1991); *Landreth Timber Co. v. Landreth*, 731 F.2d 1348, 1353 (9th Cir. 1984), *rev'd on other grounds*, 471 U.S. 681 (1985); *Pellegrino v. Nesbit*, 203 F.2d 463, 465 (9th Cir. 1953) ("intervention should be allowed even after final judgment where it is necessary to preserve some right which cannot be otherwise protected").

A party has standing to defend on appeal a law or regulation even though the government has acquiesced in the district court's determination of invalidity if it can demonstrate Article III standing. *E.g., Didrickson v. U.S. Dep't of Interior*, 982 F.2d 1332 (9th Cir. 1992) ("Generally, an intervenor may appeal from any order adversely affecting the interest that served as the basis for intervention provided that the requirements of Article III are satisfied.") *Id.* at 1338 *citing Yniguez*, 939 F.2d at 731; *Schultz v. Williams*, 44 F.3d 48, 52-53 (2d Cir. 1994) ("an intervenor's right to continue a suit in the absence of the party on whose side intervention was permitted is contingent upon a showing by the intervenor that he fulfills the requirements of Article III" *quoting Diamond v. Charles*, 476 U.S. 54, 68 (1986)). None of these cases discuss state law empowerment as an additional criteria.

[20] Because intervention was sought in the Ninth Circuit, the phraseology of the *Sagebrush* four part test will be utilized. This Court implicitly acknowledged this test in *Arizona v. California*, 460 U.S. 605, 614-615 (1983), and has never articulated any additional requirement (*e.g.*, state law empowerment) for intervention under Fed. R. Civ. P. 24.

venor. *Id.* at 527. "Rule 24 traditionally has received a liberal construction in favor of applications for intervention." *Id.*, *quoting*, *Washington State Building & Construction Trades v. Spellman*, 684 F.2d 627 (9th Cir. 1982), *cert. denied*, *Don't Waste Wash. Legal Defense Foundation v. Washington*, 461 U.S. 913 (1983).

First, as set forth *supra* at 4-5, the Petitioner acted in a timely fashion after the Governor's announcement that he would direct the dismissal of the issue challenging the Secretary's authority. No contention was raised below that the Petitioner did not act in a timely fashion.

With respect to the second criteria, the Petitioner has an interest in protecting its right to legislate in this important area. As demonstrated *supra*, the Petitioner has sufficient interest to afford it Article III standing and, as recognized by the Ninth Circuit, Article III standing requirements are more stringent than those for intervention under Fed. R. Civ. P. 24. *Yniguez*, 939 F.2d at 735.

Third, absent involvement by this Court, the denial of intervention will practically impair the Petitioner's interests.[21] The district court opinion on the authority issue, as well as the published Ninth Circuit decision on the merits of the other issues (which presumes the authority of the Secretary to establish the Federal Subsistence Board, promulgate regulations thereunder and manage fish and wildlife) will carry the precedential weight of *stare decisis*. As recognized by this Court, *stare decisis* is a powerful force. *United States v. Maine*, 420 U.S. 515, 527 (1975). *See also*, *Hubbard v. United States*, ___ U.S. ___, 63 U.S.L.W. 4393 (May 16, 1995); *U.S. South Florida Water Management Dist.*, 922 F.2d 704, 709 (11th Cir.), *cert. denied*, *West Palm Beach County Farm Bureau v. United States*, 502

---

[21] The Ninth Circuit emphasized in *Yniguez* that the third requirement is one of *practical* impairment, not whether the intervenors would be bound. *Yniguez*, 939 F.2d at 735.

U.S. 953 (1991); *Chiles v. Thornburgh*, 865 F.2d 1197, 1214 (11th Cir. 1989). As a practical matter, a state or federal court in Alaska is unlikely to issue a decision that conflicts with the district court's order in the present case. The effect of the district court's decision on subsequent courts thus provides a further basis for intervention.

Finally, the fourth requirement of inadequate representation was met when the Petitioner learned of the Governor's plan to dismiss the issue challenging the Secretary's authority from consideration on appeal.[22] When the Stipulation of Dismissal was approved by the Ninth Circuit, the Petitioner's interest in vindicating its ability to legislate and to regulate the use and allocation of Alaska's natural resources was not represented by anyone — and no representation constitutes inadequate representation. *See Yniguez*, 939 F.2d at 737.[23]

II. THE NINTH CIRCUIT'S RULING IS IN CONFLICT WITH THIS COURT'S PRECEDENT AND THAT OF THE OTHER CIRCUITS.

The Ninth Circuit, confronted with the issue of legislative standing for the first time in this case,[24] incorrectly ruled that

---

[22] This Court has held that the inadequate representation requirement "is satisfied if the [proposed intervenor] shows that representation of his interest may be inadequate" and that "the burden of making the showing should be treated as minimal." *Trbovich v. United Mine Workers of America*, 404 U.S. 528, 538 n.10 (1972).

[23] Petitioner has satisfied both the Article III standing requirement and the Fed. R. Civ. P. 24 intervention requirements. However, as this Court's opinion in *Diamond v. Charles*, 476 U.S. 54 (1986) acknowledges, there is a split of authority in the lower federal courts on the issue of whether a party seeking to intervene before a district court must satisfy the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 24, must demonstrate Article III standing, or both. This case affords this Court the perfect opportunity to clarify the interplay between Article III standing and the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 24.

[24] In *Yniguez*, the Ninth Circuit found that a sponsor of a state constitutional amendment had standing to pursue an appeal because its stake in the

the Petitioner "is not empowered under state law to intervene in this appeal."[25] With this ruling, the Ninth Circuit has impermissibly enlarged the requirements under Article III and/or Fed. R. Civ. P. 24 (Intervention) in direct conflict with this Court's precedent and that of the Third,[26] Fifth,[27] Tenth,[28] Eleventh[29] and District of Columbia Circuits.[30] All of these decisions find legislative standing and authorize intervention

---

outcome was sufficiently similar to that of a state legislature. *Yniguez*, 939 F.2d at 732. This comparison is dicta, however, and does not constitute an opinion of the Ninth Circuit on legislative standing.

[25] *See supra* note 3.

[26] *Ameron, Inc. v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*, 787 F.2d 875, 888 (3rd Cir. 1986), *cert. dismissed*, 488 U.S. 918 (1988); *Dennis v. Luis*, 741 F.2d 628, 631 (3rd Cir. 1984).

[27] *Korioth v. Briscoe*, 523 F.2d 1271, 1277-1278 (5th Cir. 1975).

[28] *Mountain States Legal Foundation v. Costle*, 630 F.2d 754 (10th Cir. 1980), *cert. denied*, 450 U.S. 1050 (1981). In *Mountain States*, the Tenth Circuit appropriately rested its decision denying intervention to twenty-seven members of the Colorado Legislature on its finding that the legislators had failed to establish the "personal stake" in the controversy necessary to support standing under Article III, not that the legislators needed "additional state law empowerment" in order to intervene. Interestingly, the court suggested that a Resolution passed by the Colorado Legislature indicating a consensus legislative position contrary to the position taken by the Attorney General on behalf of the State of Colorado might well have sufficiently particularized the injury to the legislators to have created the "personal stake" in the controversy necessary to support "standing" under Article III. *Id.* at 771. As discussed more fully *supra* at 4-5, the Alaska Legislature passed just such a Resolution.

[29] *Chiles v. Thornburgh*, 865 F.2d 1197 (11th Cir. 1989) (denying intervention because a state senator failed to establish Article III standing; no discussion of requirement of additional state law empowerment beyond Article III).

[30] *Barnes v. Kline*, 759 F.2d 21, 25-26 (D.C. Cir. 1984), *vacated as moot*, *Burke v. Barnes*, 479 U.S. 361 (1987); *Moore v. U.S. House of Rep.*, 733 F.2d 946 (D.C. Cir. 1984), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 1106 (1985); *Kennedy v. Sampson*, 511 F.2d 430, 433-436 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

when the party has sustained a direct injury; none require an affirmative showing of federal or state law empowerment to seek redress from the federal courts under Article III. However, even if the Ninth Circuit were permitted to require a potential intervenor to affirmatively demonstrate state law "empowerment" or authorization, the Petitioner has done so.

A. The Holding That A Potential Intervenor Must Demonstrate That It Is "Empowered Under State Law" To Intervene Impermissibly Restricts Access to the Federal Courts By Expanding The Requirements of Article III (Standing) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 24 (Intervention).

There is nothing in either Article III of the United States Constitution or Fed. R. Civ. P. 24 that requires a prospective intervenor to demonstrate that it has affirmative state law "empowerment" or authorization to bring a lawsuit in federal court. None of this Court's authority cited in Section I, *supra*, so suggests. For example, in *Sixty-Seventh Minnesota State Senate v. Beens*, this Court found that intervention was appropriate because the legislature would be "directly affected by the District Court's orders." 406 U.S. at 194. This Court stated that whether a legislative body — in that case the Minnesota State Senate — could appropriately intervene was settled by its affirmance of *Silver v. Jordan*, 241 F. Supp. 576 (S.D. Cal. 1964), *aff'd*, 381 U.S. 415 (1965) in which it stated that:

> The California State Senate's motion to intervene as a substantially interested party was granted *because it would be directly affected* by the decree of this court.

406 U.S. at 194 *quoting Silver*, 241 F. Supp. at 579 (emphasis added). Neither *Beens* nor *Jordan* discussed any perceived requirement to show affirmative empowerment under state law.[31]

---

[31] By establishing a state law empowerment requirement, the Ninth Circuit abrogated its responsibilities under federal "separation of powers" doctrine to resolve all "cases" and "controversies" properly before it under

In addition, none of the Circuit Court cases on this issue impose such a requirement. For example, in *Dennis v. Luis*, the Third Circuit found that members of the Virgin Island's Legislature had standing to challenge the Governor's appointment of an individual as "acting" Commissioner of Commerce. 741 F.2d at 631. The legislature's advice and consent to the appointment of a Commissioner was vested by statute only in members of the legislature, so that their allegations that their right to advise and consent had been usurped by the Governor and his appointee were sufficiently personal to constitute injury in fact. *Id.* Similarly, in *Korioth v. Briscoe*, the Fifth Circuit held that a state legislature has standing if the challenged action undermines the effectiveness of a specific legislative power. 523 F.2d at 1277-1278.

Finally, the Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit has consistently held that "either house of Congress has standing to challenge the injury to its participation in the lawmaking process." *Barnes v. Kline*, 759 F.2d at 25-26, *discussing Kennedy v. Sampson*, 511 F.2d at 434-36 & nn. 13 & 17. Again, none of

---

Article III of the United States Constitution. As this Court made abundantly clear in *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555 (1992), all "separation of powers" issues are subsumed within a federal court's initial determination that the party has standing to bring the "case" or "controversy" under Article III. Once a party has established its standing under Article III — as Petitioner did below and does here — proper federal separation of powers requires the court to hear the "case." *See also Duke Power Co. v. Carolina Envtl. Study Group*, 438 U.S. 59 (1978) (finding of particularized injury necessary to support Article III standing ensures that the court is functioning within the proper and properly limited role of the courts in a democratic society); *Moore*, 733 F.2d at 956-65 (Scalia, J. concurring) (concluding that "separation of powers" analysis is subsumed within the court's determination of Article III "standing" and criticizing "remedial discretion" doctrine whereby courts refuse to hear cases brought by legislative litigants, irrespective of existence of Article III standing of legislative litigants, as contrary to proper "separation of powers" under the Constitution).

these cases can be read to require additional federal or state law empowerment beyond standing.

The Ninth Circuit's ruling has, in effect, created an additional requirement that significantly restricts access to federal courts and, as succinctly stated by the D.C. Circuit in *Metcalf v. National Petroleum Council*, 553 F.2d 176, 189 (D.C. Cir. 1977), the federal courts are open to all litigants who can satisfy the requirements of the standing doctrine as developed by the Supreme Court.

B. The Petitioner Has Demonstrated That It Is Not Prohibited Under State Law From Challenging The Secretary's Regulations.

Even if this Court found that a legislature must demonstrate affirmative empowerment under state law prior to bringing an action in federal court, the Petitioner has so demonstrated. The Petitioner is not prohibited under Alaska state law from challenging the Secretary's regulations. To the contrary, such authority is delineated by statute and by the Petitioner's Resolution.[32]

Alaska Statute 24.20.060(4)(E) (A-84) states that the Petitioner (through a legislative council) may:

> do all things necessary to carry out legislative directives and law, and the duties set out in the uniform rules of the legislature.

---

[32] The Ninth Circuit's conclusion that the Petitioner was not empowered under state law to intervene is simply wrong. First, the Petitioner passed a Resolution authorizing it to intervene in the lawsuit. A-6. *See, e.g., INS v. Chadha*, 462 U.S. 919 (1983). In *Chadha*, the Senate and House authorized intervention by Resolution prior to filing a motion to intervene, which the Court of Appeals granted. *Id.* at 930, n.5. *See also Sixty-Seven Minnesota*, 406 U.S. at 193. Second, as demonstrated *infra*, Petitioner has statutory authority to bring a lawsuit in its own name.

The language to "do all things necessary" encompasses the right to bring a lawsuit to defend the Petitioner's interests.[33] In addition, Section 24.20.060(4) (F) (A-84) specifically authorizes the Petitioner (through a legislative council):

> to sue in the name of the legislature during the interim between sessions if authorized by majority vote of the full membership of the council.

Thus, Section 24.20.060(4)(F) clarifies that the Petitioner may bring a lawsuit between sessions as well as during sessions. To find that the Petitioner may take broader actions between sessions than it may during sessions would be contrary to common sense. *See First United Methodist Church of Hyattsville v. U.S. Gypsum Co.*, 882 F.2d 862, 869 (4th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 493 U.S. 1070 (1990); *Gibraltar Financial Corp. of Cal. v. United States*, 825 F.2d 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (absurd results should be avoided).[34]

III. EXCEPTIONAL IMPORTANCE OF THE UNDERLYING ISSUES

A. The District Court Opinion Has Placed The Sovereignty of the State of Alaska In Jeopardy.

The authority to administer and regulate natural resources on the public lands is and has been a traditional function of the State Police Power and not one regulated by the federal government. *Kleppe v. New Mexico*, 426 U.S. 529, 545 (1976); *De-*

---

[33] Alaska law limiting the right to sue does exist. For example, Alaska's Constitution, Article III, Section 16 prohibits suits by the Governor against the Petitioner. A-80. Accordingly, if the drafters had intended to prohibit a lawsuit by the Petitioner against the Governor, or anyone else, they would have explicitly done so.

[34] Should there be any concern, however, that the motion to intervene poses an undecided question of state law, then the court of appeals should have certified the question to the Alaska Supreme Court pursuant to Alaska R. App. P. 407. *See Texas v. Pullman*, 312 U.S. 496 (1941); *Warwick v. State ex rel Chance*, 548 P.2d 384 (Alaska 1976).

fenders of Wildlife v. Andrus, 627 F.2d 1238, 1248 (D.C. Cir. 1980). When, as in this case, Congress legislates in an area traditionally reserved to the states, this Court begins with the "assumption that the historic police powers of the States" are not displaced by a federal statute "unless that was the clear and manifest purpose of Congress" to do so. *Rice v. Santa Fe Elevator Corp.*, 331 U.S. 218, 230 (1947); *California v. ARC America Corp.*, 490 U.S. 93, 101 (1989); *Lopez*, 115 S. Ct. at 1640 (Kennedy, J. concurring).

1. Violation of Federal Law — The Petitioner's Exclusive Right to Manage Fish and Wildlife on Public Lands Is Guaranteed by the Alaska Statehood Act and Compact and the Alaska State Constitution, Both Of Which Are Congressionally Ratified.

The Petitioner has managed the natural resources in Alaska in a unitary system (one system of state regulation as to all lands, state and federal), as it is done in all other states, since 1960 when management was ceded to it pursuant to the Alaska Statehood Act and Compact and the Alaska Constitution.[35] The regime established by the district court, however, calls for a dual system of management: one for the federal lands and another for the state lands — one run by the traditional state management authorities and the other by the Secretary through the Federal Subsistence Board. Nothing in ANILCA, nor in the Alaska Constitution and the Alaska Statehood Act and Compact, envisions such a dual system of management.

2. ANILCA's Plain Language Prohibits Federal Usurpation of the Petitioner's Authority.

Nowhere in ANILCA did Congress authorize the Secretary to strip away from the State of Alaska the management of fish and wildlife on the public lands if there was no statewide

[35] *See supra* at 10-11; A-75, 80-83.

subsistence priority.[36] Had Congress intended the Secretary to have such authority, it would have so provided as it did in, *e.g.*, ANILCA Sections 805 ("the Secretary . . . *shall establish* at least six Alaska subsistence resource regions . . . ") pertaining to local and regional councils and 808(b) ("the Secretary *shall* promptly implement the program . . .") pertaining to national parks and monuments.[37] 16 U.S.C. §§ 3115, 3118 (emphasis added). Congress certainly never intended the Secretary or the court to divine from the interstices of the statute any authority to promulgate regulations usurping the traditional management authority of the State.

In fact, Congress codified the presumption against preemption in Section 1314(b), 16 U.S.C. § 3202(b) where it said "[e]xcept as *specifically* provided otherwise by this Act, *nothing is intended to enlarge or diminish responsibility and authority* of the Secretary over the management of the public lands." (emphasis added). With this Section, Congress established that silence is a denial of authority, not a statutory "gap" entitling the Secretary to unilaterally expand his authority. ANILCA's legislative history supports this conclusion.[38]

---

[36] In fact, the district court incorrectly found that Congress "unintentionally and inadvertently" failed to provide such authority in ANILCA. A-26.

[37] It is clear from the language of the statute that Congress never intended the Secretary to have such authority. *E.g.*, *BFP v. Resolution Trust Corp.*, _____ U.S. _____, 114 S. Ct.. 1757, 1761 (1994) (it is generally presumed that Congress acted intentionally when it includes particular language in one section of the statute but omits it in another); *Russello v. United States*, 464 U.S. 16, 23 (1983) (court will refrain from concluding that differing language in two subsections has the same meaning due to some mistake in draftsmanship); *United States v. Espinoza-Leon*, 873 F.2d 743, 746 (4th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 924 (1989).

[38] Congress deliberately retreated from giving the Secretary management authority and inserted § 1314 to ensure that ANILCA would not be interpreted to give indirectly what it chose to withhold. *See* Appendix to Decision of the District Court, March 30, 1995. A-48-53.

Thus, Congress, as the district court found, gave the Secretary no specific statutory authority to preempt State management of fish and wildlife on federal lands under the Commerce or Property clauses of the Constitution. This being the case, the Secretary's preemption of the Petitioner's legislative authority to manage the natural resources of Alaska is contrary to this Court's holding in *Kleppe* and *ARC America Corp.*, *supra*, and must fall.

3. The District Court Opinion Permits The Head of An Agency To Make a Self-Determination of Authority Despite Clear Statutory Language to the Contrary and Impermissibly Expands Agency Discretion Under *Chevron*.

Notwithstanding the district court's finding that Congress failed to specifically delegate authority to the Secretary, the court nonetheless upheld the Secretary's exercise of regulatory authority based on the Secretary's own unilateral determination of authority. The court deferred to the Secretary's self-determination of authority citing *Chevron USA v. Natural Resources Defense Council*, 467 U.S. 837 (1984). A-24-27.

The district court's use of *Chevron* impermissibly expands agency discretion under this Court's precedent. *Chevron* permits a court to defer to an agency action *if* it finds that the agency's enabling legislation permits agency action in a given area but is silent or ambiguous as to the specific action to be taken. As this Court has said, "a precondition to deference under *Chevron* is a congressional delegation of administrative authority." *Adams Fruit Co. v. Barrett*, 494 U.S. 638, 649 (1990); *Bowen v. Georgetown Univ. Hosp.*, 488 U.S. 204, 208 (1988).

Here, the Secretary's self-determination[39] of authority is not entitled to *Chevron* deference because, as demonstrated

[39] Although the Secretary may have believed, as the district court noted, that "chaos" would result had he not acted in promulgating regulations, such

supra, ANILCA did not expressly grant the Secretary authority to act in this area. Section 1314(b) of ANILCA is irreconcilable with any argument that requires the court to infer Secretarial authority to manage from the policies and purposes of the Act. The Secretary cannot bootstrap itself into an area in which it has no jurisdiction or authority.

B. Resolution of These Issues is Urgent

The exceptional importance of this case presents a compelling basis for certiorari, which is manifest when one considers what the Ninth Circuit's opinion denying Petitioner's intervention does. *See supra* at 3. What the Ninth Circuit's opinion does not do, is just as compelling. By denying intervention, the Ninth Circuit precludes any party to this action or possibly any future litigant from addressing the critical substantive issues regarding the Secretary's authority to regulate the taking of fish and game under ANILCA. These issues include, *inter alia*: 1) whether the Secretary's regulation is a breach of the Alaska Statehood Act and Compact and the Alaska Constitution;[40] 2) whether Congress' failure to explicitly grant the Secretary such authority in ANILCA, in conjuction with the district court's findings of authority, improperly expands the doctrine of federal preemption; 3) whether the Secretary's self-determination of authority is entitled to deference under *Chevron*; 4) whether ANILCA's "singling out" of Alaska for federal regulation is impermissible disparate treatment amongst the states;[41] 5) whether ANILCA is a proper exercise of Congress' power to regulate *interstate*

---

chaos or crisis does not give rise to authority to act. *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579 (1952). A-20.

[40] *See, e.g., Beecher v. Wetherby*, 95 U.S. 517 (1877) (Congress powerless to effect disposition of land granted to State of Wisconsin under Wisconsin's Compact with the United States).

[41] A-60, n.9. *See, e.g., Stearns v. Minnesota*, 179 U.S. 223, 240, 242 (1900) (articulating the deference to be afforded the scope of a state's legislative power under its Constitution and noting the impropriety of Congress' disparate treatment of a particular state).

commerce under the Commerce Clause;[42] 6) whether ANILCA is a proper exercise of Congress' power under the Property Clause considering the Alaska Statehood Act and Compact; and 7) whether, under the Fourteenth Amendment, Congress can appropriately create special rights and privileges for individuals based on their geography ("rural" versus "urban").[43] This case also raises numerous "states-rights" and "federalism" issues regarding ANILCA's propriety under the Fifth and Tenth Amendments and the Guarantee Clause of the United States Constitution. *See, e.g., New York v. United States*, 505 U.S. 144 (1992).

The district court opinion leaves open the possibility that the federal Secretary will have the authority to regulate fish and wildlife on the state public lands if the failure to regulate those resources affects the rural preference on the federal public lands *viz.* pervasive federal management of fish and wildlife on all lands and waterways in Alaska.[44]

Finally, the opinion creates a conflict between the Alaska Supreme Court and the Alaska District Court which requires the court's intervention. As discussed *supra*, the Alaska Supreme Court found the Petitioner's attempt to establish a rural priority unconstitutional under the Alaska Constitution. The district court, however, required the priority. The district court's con-

---

[42] *See, e.g., Gregory v. Ashcroft*, 501 U.S. 452, 464 (1991) (requiring an explicit manifestation of Congress' intent to intrude on traditional state powers via the Commerce Clause: "[T]o give the state-displacing weight of federal law to mere congressional *ambiguity* would evade the very procedure for law-making on which *Garcia [v. San Antonio Metro. Transit Auth.*, 469 U.S. 528 (1985)] relied to protect states' interests." (citation omitted, emphasis in original).

[43] *See Gregory*, 501 U.S. at 468. ("We noted, however, that the principles of federalism that constrain Congress' exercise of its Commerce Clause powers are attenuated when Congress acts pursuant to its powers to enforce the Civil War Amendments.").

[44] Apparently, one of the cases pending raises this very issue. A-9-10.

clusions render portions of the Alaska Constitution and Alaska Statehood Compact void. Although Petitioner recognizes that a federal statute which guarantees a constitutional right may supersede a state constitution, the ANILCA preference, however, does not provide such a right.

Petitioner believes that the State will file for a rehearing with a suggestion for a rehearing en banc in *State v. Babbitt* with regard to the navigational servitude issue, and failing that, contemplates the possibility of a petition for certiorari. Because of the importance and interrelationship of these issues,[45] this Court should grant Petitioner's request for relief.

The critical necessity for speedy and definitive resolution of these issues was recognized by the district court's decision to take the highly unusual step of inviting the parties to seek immediate interlocutory review of the questions it certified. The Ninth Circuit's refusal to grant intervention and squarely confront these issues confirms the district court's worst fear — not that its decision be reversed (as it should be) — but that its decision be ultimately reversed only after tens of millions of federal tax dollars and extraordinary amounts of judicial resources, as well as the resources of myriad litigants, be wasted.[46]

---

[45] Other cases are currently pending which also necessitate the court's resolution of the authority issue. *See* A-8-10.

[46] In its petition to the Ninth Circuit, the Attorney General noted that the federal government estimated that it would cost the federal government over $40 million per year to implement the district court's decision.

IV. CONCLUSION

The denial by the court of appeals of the Petitioner's intervention and the entry of the dismissal to the challenge of the Secretary's authority should be reversed and the matter remanded with instructions to permit Petitioner's intervention and full participation in this case. Alternatively, the petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted on the intervention issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Leonard Garment
Joseph J. Aronica
Counsel of Record for Petitioner
Edith Eisner Albert
Mark A. Simko
Mudge Rose Guthrie Alexander
& Ferdon
1200 - 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 973-1200

Counsel for the Legislature of the
State of Alaska

June 2, 1995

No. ____

IN THE

Supreme Court Of The United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1994

LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA,
Petitioner,

v.

STATE OF ALASKA,
Respondent,

v.

BRUCE BABBITT, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR
Respondent.

On Petition For a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals For the Ninth Circuit

APPENDIX

Leonard Garment
Joseph J. Aronica
Counsel of Record for Petitioner
Edith Eisner Albert
Mark A. Simko
Mudge Rose Guthrie Alexander & Ferdon
1200 - 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 973-1200

APPENDIX
TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Order of the Court Denial of Alaska State Legislature's Emergency Motions to Intervene and to Continue Challenge to Secretary's Authority, entered February 7, 1995	1
Amended Order of the Court Denial of Alaska State Legislature's Emergency Motions to Intervene and to Continue Challenge to Secretary's Authority entered February 10, 1995	3
Order of the Court Denial of Rehearing on Alaska State Legislature's Emergency Motions to Intervene and to Continue Challenge to Secretary's Authority entered March 7, 1995	5
Order of the District Court Staying the Effect of the March 30, 1994 Decision Pending Interlocutory Appeal	6
Decision of the District Court March 30, 1994	12
Decision of the Ninth Circuit in continued appeal of State v. Babbit April 20, 1995	54
Letter from the Alaska State Legislature to Governor Tony Knowles January 24, 1995	65

TABLE OF CONTENTS — Continued

Page

Letter from the Alaska State Legislature to Clerk of the Court U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit January 25, 1995 66

The Legislature of the State of Alaska, 19th Legislature, 1st Session, Senate Concurrent Resolution #6. Passed by the Senate, January 26, 1995 Passed by the House, January 30, 1995 70

United States Constitution Article III 74

Alaska Statehood Act and Compact Act of July 7, 1958 Pub. L. 85-508, 72 Stat. 339 (1958) 75

Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act ("ANILCA") Pub. L. No. 96-487, 94 Stat., 2374 (1980), 16 U.S.C. § 3101 *et seq.* 76

Subsistence Management Regulations For Public Lands in Alaska, Subparts A, B, and C 57 Fed. Reg. 22940 (May 29, 1992). 78

The Constitution of the State of Alaska 80

Alaska Statutes, Section 24.20.060 84

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

STATE OF ALASKA,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

BRUCE BABBITT,

Secretary of the Interior, et al.,

Defendants-Appellees

KATIE JOHN, et al.,

Plaintiffs-Appellees,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

Defendants-Appellants

ORDER

Nos. 94-35480, 94-35481

D.C. Nos. CV-92-00264-HRH, CV-90-00484-HRH

The Alaska State Legislature filed an emergency motion for leave to intervene or, in the alternative, for substitution or, in the alternative, for stay, as well as a memorandum in support of its motion. The Alaska State Attorney General and the United States filed letter briefs opposing the emergency motion. After considering the letter briefs and the authorities cited therein, we conclude the Alaska State Legislature is not empowered under state law to intervene in this appeal.

IT IS ORDERED that the Alaska State Legislature's alternative motions for intervention, substitution, and stay of the stipulated dismissal are DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the issue covered by the dismissal stipulated is dismissed from the case and need not be addressed at oral argument.

FOR THE COURT
CATHY A. CATTERSON
CLERK OF COURT

By:_____
Deputy Clerk

FILED February 7, 1995

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

STATE OF ALASKA,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

BRUCE BABBITT,

Secretary of the Interior, et al.,

Defendants-Appellees

KATIE JOHN, et al.,

Plaintiffs-Appellees.

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

Defendants-Appellants

AMENDED ORDER

Nos. 94-35480, 94-35481

D.C. Nos. CV-92-00264-HRH, CV-90-00484-HRH

Before: WRIGHT, HALL and WIGGINS, Circuit Judges.

The order filed February 7, 1995, is amended to read:

The Alaska State Legislature filed an emergency motion for leave to intervene or, in the alterative, for substitution or, in the alterative, for stay, as well as a memorandum in support of its motion. The Alaska State Attorney General and the United States filed letter briefs opposing the emergency motion. After considering the letter briefs and the authorities cited therein, we

conclude the Alaska State Legislature is not empowered under state law to intervene in this appeal.

IT IS ORDERED that the Alaska State Legislature's alternative motions for intervention, substitution, and stay of the stipulated dismissal are DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the issue covered by the stipulated dismissal, whether ANILCA authorizes the Secretary to manage the subsistence priority in the absence of consistent Alaska laws, is dismissed from the case and need not be addressed at oral argument.

FOR THE COURT
CATHY A. CATTERSON
CLERK OF COURT

By:_____
Deputy Clerk

FILED February 10, 1995

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

STATE OF ALASKA,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

BRUCE BABBITT,
Secretary of the Interior, et al.,
Defendants-Appellees

KATIE JOHN, et al.,
Plaintiffs-Appellees,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,
Defendants-Appellants

ORDER

Nos. 94-35480, 94-35481

D.C. Nos. CV-92-00264-HRH, CV-90-00484-HRH

Before: WRIGHT, HALL and WIGGINS, Circuit Judges.

Counsel for the Legislature of the State of Alaska have filed with this court a Petition for Rehearing with a Suggestion for Rehearing En Banc or, in the alternative, a Motion for Reconsideration of the court's order of February 7, 1995.

The Motion for Reconsideration is DENIED. The Petition for Rehearing is DENIED. The Suggestion for Rehearing En Banc is REJECTED. Ninth Circuit General Order 6.11.

FILED March 7, 1995

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA

KATIE JOHN, et al.,

Plaintiffs,(Consolidated)

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.

Defendants.

STATE OF ALASKA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

BRUCE BABBITT, Secretary of the Interior, et al.,

Defendants.

No. A90-0484-CIV (HRH)
(Consolidated)

ORDER

(Case Status; Stay of Proceedings)

Concurrent herewith the court has rendered a decision on a group of motions involving plaintiffs, Katie John, *et al.*, and the State of Alaska, and the federal defendants in these consolidated cases. These motions raised two questions:

(1) Who, as between the Secretaries of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture on the one hand, and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game on the other hand, are entitled to manage public (federal) lands under Title VIII of ANILCA?

(2) What lands are included in "public lands" for purposes of Title VIII of ANILCA?

The latter question has focused upon the matter of whether or not navigable waters are "public lands" for purposes of ANILCA. The court's decision on these two issues will plainly have far-reaching effect for all concerned. Simply put, enforcement of the court's decision will preclude the State of Alaska from managing fish resources in navigable waters throughout the State of Alaska for subsistence purposes as it has done for in excess of ten years and will require that the Secretaries of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture, through the Federal Subsistence Board, immediately take over and implement Title VIII of ANILCA as to all navigable waters in the State of Alaska. The court's order will entail a major disruption of the management of fish in Alaska for subsistence purposes. It would be naive of the court to think that its decision will be well received by either state or federal authorities, for each have seemingly been quite satisfied with the *status quo*. It would not be surprising if both the state and the federal governments would desire to seek review of the court's decision on the "who" and "where" issues as regards Title VIII of ANILCA.

Accordingly, this court's decision of March 30, 1994, is stayed for a period of 60 days during which time any party to these consolidated cases may serve and file an interlocutory appeal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b).

The court's decision of March 30, 1994, involves two controlling questions of law as to which a party might seek interlocutory review:

(1) Does 16 U.S.C. § 3115(a)-(c), when considered with 16 U.S.C. § 3202, fail to empower the Secretaries of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture to implement Title VIII of ANILCA under circumstances where, as here, the state had once qualified under § 3115(d) to manage fish in Alaska for subsistence purposes by virtue of having adopted a law of general application consistent with Title VIII of ANILCA?

(2) Does the term "public lands" as defined in Title VIII of ANILCA, 16 U.S.C. § 3101(3) include navigable waters within the State of Alaska?

The two foregoing questions are *the* fundamental issues which affect the implementation of the fishing by rural Alaskans for subsistence purposes. If the court's decision on either of the foregoing questions is not correct, any further action that this court might take in implementing Title VIII of ANILCA would be fundamentally and irreparably flawed. There would be a tremendous, tragic waste of the time and money of federal regulators if the court were to mistakenly require that they assume responsibility for the management of fish for subsistence purposes in the navigable waters of the State of Alaska.

The court is of the opinion that an immediate review of its decision of March 30, 1994, will materially advance the ultimate termination of this litigation. Indeed, if the court's holding on either of the foregoing issues is wrong, the plaintiffs will, for all practical purposes, have to pursue their subsistence fishing rights first before state regulators and then in state courts, not this federal court.[1] Conversely, if this court's decision is correct, then the court can, with confidence, move forward with implementation of Title VIII of ANILCA in not only this case but also in many other cases, some of which are already pending and present these same issues in one form or another. In short, it is vital to the subsistence fishing programs of both the State of Alaska and the federal government that the court and parties have an early, final decision as to who is going to regulate fish in the navigable waters of Alaska.

Although the court has a high degree of confidence in the appropriateness of its decision, the arguments made by the parties who did not prevail are far from frivolous or baseless.

---

[1] Continuing federal court jurisdiction would be possible under some circumstances but the *Katie John* case could have to go to state court if public lands do not include navigable waters.

The court entertained multiple rounds of briefing and multiple oral arguments because of the complexity and importance of issues raised; and, in the language of 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b), there was substantial ground for differing opinions as to the issues which the court has decided in this case.

Accordingly, the court certifies the foregoing issues for interlocutory appeal. Further proceedings in this case and the operation of the court's decision of March 30, 1994, are stayed for a period of 60 days to allow the filing of appeals; and if one or more appeals are filed, the said order and further proceedings in this case will remain stayed pending a decision by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

In light of the foregoing, any other motions pending in this case are denied with leave to renew the same as provided below.

With the exception of motions concurrently decided by the court in *Peratrovich, et al. v. United States of America, et al.*, case A92-0734 Civil, all motions pending in all of the jointly managed cases are denied with leave to renew the same as provided below.

Native Village of Stevens et al. v. McVee, case A92-0567 Civil, raises the question of whether or not the Federal Subsistence Board has the power to regulate wildlife off of public lands insofar as is necessary to protect the subsistence taking of wildlife on public lands. The court believes that this same issue is likely to arise as to fisheries also. The court's decision of March 30, 1994, did not reach and was not intended to address this issue. While the court is not wedded to this idea, it strikes the court that the extraterritorial powers, if any, of the Federal Subsistence Board (inevitably this will become the "Where II" issue) is the next issue of general application which the court should take up.

The Where II issue was raised, briefed, argued and submitted to the court in *Native Village of Stevens*. It is the court's

current, tentative view of this issue that, as presently constituted, the Federal Subsistence Board does not have authority from the Secretaries of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture to adopt regulations having an effect beyond the boundaries of public lands. Thus, the Where II issue will involve a secondary question of whether the secretaries have power to authorize the Federal Subsistence Board to adopt regulations affecting the management of fish or wildlife on lands other than public (federal) lands. As to the latter question, the court expresses no opinion for two reasons. Firstly, the matter presents exceedingly difficult management problems revolving about how state and federal fish and wildlife management authorities will interrelate and work with one another. *See* 16 U.S.C. § 3112(3). It is clear to the court that there should, indeed must be, an effective working arrangement between these two fish and game management entities. However, the court entertains doubt as to the circumstances under which it may have the power to intervene so as to require cooperative, joint management of fish and wildlife. Secondly, it strikes the court that extraterritorial jurisdiction is a matter which should (especially because of the court's last comments as to joint management) be addressed in the first instance by the Secretaries of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture.

It will, nevertheless, be the court's inclination, if the parties so desire, to receive updated, supplemental briefing on the Where II issue for the purpose of expanding that discussion to the extent necessary to focus on fisheries rather than wildlife and the possible need for action by the secretaries as to the extra-territorial powers of the Federal Subsistence Board. The court would have the parties address the foregoing in their report to the court as required hereinafter.

Irrespective of whether any appeal is taken from the court's decision of March 30, 1994, counsel for the parties in these jointly managed cases shall, at a date and time agreeable to them

at least 60 but not more than 75 days from the date of this order, confer with one another for purposes of evaluating the posture of this and the other jointly managed cases. The court will be particularly interested in the matter of whether there is any motion practice which can meaningfully and appropriately go forward if an interlocutory appeal is taken. If no such appeal is taken, then it will become especially appropriate that counsel consider what additional motion practice is necessary in these jointly managed cases and in what order those motions should be presented and decided by the court. Counsel shall circulate and file a report of this conference on or before June 16, 1994. Upon receipt of that report, the court will convene a status conference in all of the jointly managed cases, if that is the desire of the parties, or enter an appropriate order.

A copy of this order shall be served upon counsel for all parties in all of the jointly managed cases. A copy of this order, with an appropriate cover page, shall be file in all of the jointly managed cases.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 30 day of March, 1994.

/s/
United States District Judge

cc: See attached service list
Appeals Clerk

D.Alaska, 1994.

John v. U.S.

KATIE JOHN, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

Defendants.

STATE OF ALASKA,

Plaintiff,

v.

BRUCE BABBITT, Secretary of the Interior, et al.,

Defendants.

JOHN v. UNITED STATES

No. A90-0484-CV (HRH)

Consolidated with No. A92-0264-CV (HRH).

United States District Court for the District of Alaska.

March 30, 1994, Decided

Robert Anderson, Native American Rights Fund, Anchorage, AK

Donald Mitchell, Anchorage, AK

Cheri Jacobus, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, Anchorage, Alaska

James Bailey, Clinton, Wa.

Lewis Gordon, ASHBORN & MASON, Anchorage AK

Michael A.D. Stanley, Juneau, AK

Dean Dunsmore, U.S. Attorney, Anchorage, AK

DECISION

Introduction

The above consolidated cases are part of a group of cases under joint management,[1] all of which raise important issues concerning the interpretation and application of Title VIII of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA). 16 U.S.C. §§ 3111-3126. During consultation with counsel for all of the parties in the jointly managed cases, a consensus was reached regarding the prioritizing of two issues to be decided by the court in these cases. These issues are: who is entitled to manage fish and game within Alaska for purposes of ANILCA, and where does ANILCA apply?

Background

Effective December 18, 1971, Congress adopted the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA). Pub.L. No. 92-203 (85 Stat. 688).[2] Section 17(d)(2)[3] of ANCSA made provision for the withdrawal from all forms of appropriation of 80 million acres of unreserved public lands in the State of Alaska for possible addition to or creation of national parks and the like. Section 17(d)(2)(A). The Secretary of the Interior was required to make periodic recommendations to Congress with respect to such lands, Section (d)(2)(C), and, by Section (d)(2)(D), Congress had five years within which to act upon the Secretary's recommendations. Not until December 2, 1980,[4] did Congress

---

[1] The jointly managed cases, in addition to those captioned above, are *Kluti Kaah Native Village of Copper Center v. State of Alaska*, No. A90-0004-CV, *Fish & Game Fund v. State of Alaska Bd. of Fisheries*, No. A92-044-CV, *Peratrovich v. United States*, No. A92-0734-CV, *Native Village of Stevens v. McVee*, No. A92-0567-CV, and *Native Village of Quinhagak v. United States*, No. A93-0023-CV.

[2] 43 U.S.C. §§ 1601-1629a.

[3] 43 U.S.C. § 1616(d)(2).

[4] Plainly Congress did not complete its work on the (d)(2) lands issue within the five years Congress originally gave itself to accomplish this chore.

finally adopt the "(d)(2)" lands bill. Pub.L. No. 96-487, (94 Stat. 2374).[5] Adopting the (d)(2) lands bill was not easy. The matter was under consideration by Congress during three presidential administrations and five sessions of Congress.

Through Title VIII of ANILCA, Congress addressed the important question of how all public lands, not just those in various management systems, should be used. More particularly, Title VIII embodied a congressional decision that those who chose to should have a right to continue to live off the land—to hunt and fish at will for sustenance. Congress found and declared in Section 801 of ANILCA[6] that:

> (1) the continuation of the opportunity for subsistence uses by rural residents of Alaska, including both Natives and non-Natives, on the public lands and by Alaska Natives on Native lands is essential to Native physical, economic, traditional, and cultural existence and to non-Native physical, economic, traditional, and social existence;
>
> (2) the situation in Alaska is unique in that, in most cases, no practical alternative means are available to replace the food supplies and other items gathered from fish and wildlife which supply rural residents dependent on subsistence uses;

When the 95th Congress adjourned in 1978 without adopting an Alaska lands bill, the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture exercised withdrawal authority which they possessed under Section 204(b) and (e) of the Federal Land Policy & Management Act to make new withdrawals, thus preserving the availability of land for (d)(2) legislation. The President also withdrew substantial additional acreage by proclamation for addition to national monuments. But for this action, the lands in question would have become available to selection by the State of Alaska under the Statehood Act or Alaska Native groups under ANCSA.

[5] 16 U.S.C. § 3101, *et seq.*

[6] 16 U.S.C. § 3111.

(3) continuation of the opportunity for subsistence uses of resources on public and other lands in Alaska is threatened by the increasing population of Alaska, with resultant pressure on subsistence resources, by sudden decline in the populations of some wildlfe species which are crucial subsistence resources, by increased accessibility of remote areas containing subsistence resources, and by taking of fish and wildlife in a manner inconsistent with recognized principles of fish and wildlife management;

(4) in order to fulfill the policies and purposes of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act [43 U.S.C.A. § 1601 et seq.] and as a matter of equity, it is necessary for the Congress to invoke its constitutional authority over Native affairs and its constitutional authority under the property clause and the commerce clause to protect and provide the opportunity for continued subsistence uses on the public lands by Native and non-Native rural residents; and

(5) the national interest in the proper regulation, protection, and conservation of fish and wildlife on the public lands in Alaska and the continuation of the opportunity for a subsistence way of life by residents of rural Alaska require that an administrative structure be established for the purpose of enabling rural residents who have personal knowledge of local conditions and requirements to have a meaningful role in the management of fish and wildlife and of subsistence uses on the public lands in Alaska.

In Section 802 of ANILCA,[7] Congress further declared it to be national policy that:

(1) consistent with sound management principles, and the conservation of healthy populations of

---

[7] 16 U.S.C. § 3112.

fish and wildlife, the utilization of the public lands in Alaska is to cause the least adverse impact possible on rural residents who depend upon subsistence uses of the resources of such lands; consistent with management of fish and wildlife in accordance with recognized scientific principles and the purposes of each unit established, designated, or expanded by or pursuant to titles II through VII of this Act, the purpose of this subchapter is to provide the opportunity for rural residents engaged in a subsistence way of life to do so;

(2) nonwasteful subsistence uses of fish and wildlife and other renewable resources shall be the priority consumptive uses of all such resources on the public lands of Alaska when it is necessary to restrict taking in order to assure the continued viability of a fish or wildlife population or the continuation of subsistence uses of such population, the taking of such population for nonwasteful subsistence uses shall be given preference on the public lands over other consumptive uses; and

(3) except as otherwise provided by this Act or other Federal laws, Federal land managing agencies, in managing subsistence activities on the public lands and in protecting the continued viability of all wild renewable resources in Alaska, shall cooperate with adjacent landowners and land managers, including Native Corporations, appropriate State and Federal agencies, and other nations.

After defining the term "subsistence uses",[8] ANILCA Section 804 established non-wasteful subsistence uses as having "priority" over the taking on public lands of fish and wildlife for other purposes.

---

[8] ANILCA Section 803, 16 U.S.C. § 3113.

With this background, we come to the statutory provision which is the focal point of the question: who is entitled to regulate the taking of fish and game on public lands in Alaska for subsistence purposes? ANILCA Section 805(d)[9] provides that:

> The Secretary shall not implement subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section if within one year from December 2, 1980, the State enacts and implements laws of general applicability which are consistent with, and which provide for the definition, preference, and participation specified in, sections 3113, 3114, and 3115, of this title, such laws, unless and until repealed, shall supersede such sections insofar as such sections govern State responsibility pursuant to this subchapter for the taking of fish and wildlife on the public lands for subsistence uses. . . .

The State of Alaska enacted such a law. Indeed, the State of Alaska was so anxious to maintain its role as the sole regulator of fish and game in the state that it had enacted a subsistence law of its own two years before Congress finished the business of fine-tuning and enacting a federal subsistence law, Title VIII of ANILCA.[10] In due course, the Secretary determined that the State of Alaska was in compliance with ANILCA such that state law superseded federal subsistence law. As a consequence, the Secretary was not required to take action and there was no

---

[9] 16 U.S.C. § 3115(d).

[10] Ch. 151, Session Laws of Alaska, 1978. Sections (4) and (5) were the main operative provisions of this state act. They were codified as AS 16.05.251 and -.255 (1978). There were difficulties with this initial act, for it was adopted by the state legislature before Congress had injected the "rural Alaska resident" concept into the preference afforded for subsistence uses of fish and wildlife into ANILCA. ANILCA Section 803, 16 U.S.C. § 3113. This situation is not relevant to this case, but is described in greater detail in an earlier decision of this court. *Bobby v. State of Alaska*, 718 F. Supp. 764 (D. Alaska 1989).

controversy over his role. It is undisputed that during this phase of the implementation of Title VIII of ANILCA, the Secretary's role was to monitor state subsistence activity, ANILCA Section 806,[11] and to carry on his other "closure and other administrative authority over the public lands[.]" ANILCA Section 805(c).[12]

By the mid-1980s, implementation of the state subsistence law for the benefit of rural Alaskans was in full swing. Not surprisingly, there was litigation. The State of Alaska had failed to provide plaintiff Katie John and others with an opportunity to pursue their traditional fishing activities at a site known as Batzulnetas. In 1985, Katie John filed suit in this court, seeking enforcement of her subsistence rights. In this regard, Congress expressly provided for district court jurisdiction over the State as regards its implementation of ANILCA. ANILCA Section 807(a).[13] This was but one of a number of similar cases, some involving fisheries, others involving game. From the court's perspective, the state subsistence program was working, albeit more slowly than rural Alaskans would have preferred. There were substantial legal difficulties, especially over the concept of what constituted "rural" Alaska. *Kenaitze Indian Tribe v. State of Alaska*, 860 F.2d 312 (9th Cir. 1988), *cert. denied*, 491 U.S. 905, 109 S.Ct. 3187 (1989).

However, the court is convinced that the state subsistence program could and would have succeeded but for the discovery of a constitutional flaw. In 1989 (a rehearing was denied in March of 1990), the Alaska Supreme Court decided *McDowell v. State*, 785 P.2d 1 (Alaska 1989). In that case, the plaintiff

---

[11] 16 U.S.C. § 3116.

[12] 16 U.S.C. § 3115(c). The Secretary's closure authority is contained in ANILCA Section 816, 16 U.S.C. § 3126. The Secretary's "other" administrative authority is generally taken to have reference to the Secretary's power to manage all other uses of public lands such that appropriate habitat is available for fish and wildlife. ANILCA Section 810, 16 U.S.C. § 3120.

[13] 16 U.S.C. § 3117(a).

successfully challenged the state subsistence program on the theory that the preference for rural Alaskans was unconstitutional. In this regard, the Alaska Supreme Court held:

> [T]he requirement contained in the 1986 subsistence statute, that one must reside in a rural area in order to participate in subsistence hunting and fishing violates sections 3, 15, and 17 of article VIII of the Alaska Constitution.

McDowell, 785 P.2d at 9.

In consideration of the fact that the Alaska Legislature would be in the session in the spring and early summer of 1990, the State of Alaska sought and obtained a stay of the operative effect of the *McDowell* decision. The Alaska Legislature failed to resolve the dilemma posed by the fact that Title VIII of ANILCA absolutely required a rural limitation in order for Alaska's subsistence law to qualify as a substitute for the federal subsistence scheme, whereas the Alaska Constitution prohibited such a residency requirement. Owing to the seriousness of this constitutional dilemma, the governor of the State of Alaska convened a special session of the legislature to take up the subsistence problem in June of 1990. Like the general session, the special session failed to find a solution to the problem.

In the meantime, the State of Alaska proceeded in the state superior court to obtain a determination of whether the exclusion of the rural preference provision of Alaska's subsistence law vitiated the entire state law or was severable. On June 20, 1990, the superior court ruled,that the rural limitation was severable from the remaining portions of Alaska's subsistence law, and that the remainder of AS 16.05.258 was viable.

In the meantime, the Secretary, anticipating that he would be called upon to implement ANILCA as to federal lands, took action to promulgate temporary regulations for subsistence

hunting and fishing in the State of Alaska. Summarizing his regulatory action, the Secretary stated:

> This rule provides temporary regulations implementing the subsistence priority for rural residents of Alaska under Title VIII of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) of 1980. The Alaska Supreme Court recently ruled that the law used by the State of Alaska to provide the subsistence priority required by Title VIII violated the Alaska Constitution. The court's action placed the State out of compliance with Title VIII. Since the State has been unable to return to compliance with Title VIII, the Federal government is required to take over the implementation of Title VIII on public lands.

55 Fed. Reg. 27,114 (June 29, 1990). The Secretary's regulations became effective July 1, 1990, the date the *McDowell* decision was to be effective. Citing the shortness of time available for deliberation and the possibility for "chaos" if the State were able to reinstitute its program, the Secretary in substance adopted the former state subsistence hunting and fishing program. *Id.* The Secretary's implicit wish that the State would find a solution to its constitutional problem was not, nor has it yet been, fulfilled. In due course, the temporary regulations were supplanted by permanent regulations. These permanent regulations, among other things, created the Federal Subsistence Board and invested it with authority to adopt regulations for the day-to-day management of subsistence hunting and fishing on public lands in Alaska. 57 Fed. Reg. 22,940 (May 29, 1992).

I.
Who is Entitled to Manage Fish and Game within Alaska for Purposes of ANILCA?

The State has moved for summary judgment on Count III of its first amended complaint in *State of Alaska v. Babbitt, [et al]*, No. A92-0264-CV.[14] The motion is opposed, and the court has invited briefing from the parties to the other jointly managed cases, some of whom have submitted briefs on this issue. Oral argument has been heard and, after further analysis of certain aspects of this portion of the case, the court called for and received supplemental briefing. The State raises the fundamental question: does the Secretary[15] have specific authority to adopt a comprehensive scheme for fish and wildlife management on "public lands" as defined in Section 102 of ANILCA?[16]

There is no disagreement about the fact that the *McDowell* decision abrogated the rural preference provision of the Alaska subsistence law. There is no dispute but that the rural preference is an essential element of the federal program. ANILCA Section 803.[17] The State contends, largely upon Sections 805(a) through (c) and 1314 of ANILCA[18] and its analysis of the legislative history of ANILCA, that Title VIII simply does not vest the Secretary with authority to assume day-to-day management of fish and game for subsistence purposes on public lands. The federal defendants, as well as Katie John and others, insist that the combination of Title VIII and the *McDowell* decision re-

---

[14] Clerk's Docket No. 113.

[15] Under ANILCA, the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Department of the Interior except as to National Forest System lands, in which case "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture. ANILCA § 3102(12); 43 U.S.C. § 1618.

[16] 16 U.S.C. § 3102.

[17] 16 U.S.C. § 3113.

[18] 16 U.S.C. §§ 3115(a)-(c) and 3202.

quired the federal government generally, and the Secretary in particular, to assume implementation of Title VIII of ANILCA.

ANILCA Section 803[19] unmistakably and unambiguously establishes a preference in favor of rural Alaskans as regards the taking of fish and wildlife from public lands. Although it is counter-intuitive to think that Congress would enact a law creating such a right and not authorize the Executive Branch to implement it, this contention of the State of Alaska is not without substance. However, for the reasons and upon the authorities discussed below, the court has concluded that unless and until the State of Alaska shall again be in compliance with Section 805(d) of ANILCA,[20] the Secretary has the authority to adopt regulations for the purpose of implementing Sections 803,[21] 804,[22] and 805[23] of ANILCA.

ANILCA Section 805(a) requires the Secretary, in consultation with the State, to establish subsistence resource regions and local and regional advisory groups, "[e]xcept as otherwise provided in subsection (d)[.]" The Alaska subsistence law being out of compliance with Title VIII, the Secretary is plainly obligated to establish these subsistence resource regions and appoint local and regional advisory groups.

ANILCA Section 805(b) requires that the Secretary assign staff sufficient to permit the local and regional advisory groups to do their work. ANILCA Section 805(c) is the provision which is critical to the State's argument. It provides:

> The Secretary, in performing his monitoring responsibility pursuant to section 3116 of this title and in the exercise of his closure and other administrative

---

19 16 U.S.C. § 3113.

20 16 U.S.C. § 3115(d).

21 16 U.S.C. § 3113.

22 16 U.S.C. § 3114.

23 16 U.S.C. § 3115.

> authority over the public lands, shall consider the report and recommendations of the regional advisory councils concerning the taking of fish and wildlife on the public lands within their respective regions for subsistence uses. The Secretary may choose not to follow any recommendation which he determines is not supported by substantial evidence, violates recognized principles of fish and wildlife conservation, or would be detrimental to the satisfaction of subsistence needs. If a recommendation is not adopted by the Secretary, he shall set forth the factual basis and the reasons for his decision.

Section 805(c) speaks of the Secretary's monitoring responsibilities, his power to effect closures of certain lands for subsistence uses (ANILCA Section 816[24]) and his other administrative authorities over public lands, but says not a word about implementing the subsistence preference for rural Alaskans created by Section 803 or the subsistence priority created by Section 804. It is in this context that the State invokes the provisions of ANILCA Section 1314[25] which provide:

> (a) Nothing in this Act is intended to enlarge or diminish the responsibility and authority of the State of Alaska for management of fish and wildlife on the public lands except as may be provided in [Title VIII of this Act[26] , or to amend the Alaska constitution.
>
> (b) Except as specifically provided otherwise by this Act, nothing in this Act is intended to enlarge or diminish the responsibility and authority of the Secretary over the management of the public lands.

---

[24] 16 U.S.C. § 3126.

[25] 16 U.S.C. § 3202.

[26] Title VIII of ANILCA was codified as subchapter 11 of chapter 51, 16 U.S.C. § 3111, *et seq.*

Traditionally in the United States, and Alaska is no exception, the federal government has deferred to state fish and game regulators with respect to the management of fish and game on federal lands. *Defenders of Wildlife v. Andrus*, 627 F.2d 1238, 1248 (D.C. Cir. 1980). The Alaska Statehood Act[27] made express provision for the transfer of authority to manage fish and game to the State of Alaska after it had established an appropriate system and demonstrated its ability to assume responsibility for such management from the federal, territorial fish and game regulators. It is in this context that the State argues that it is entitled to continue management of fish and game on public lands unless Title VIII of ANILCA provides otherwise. Again, the State's contention is that Title VIII, as discussed above, does not provide otherwise. The State's foregoing position is underscored by the parallel provision of ANILCA Section 1314(b),[28] which serves to maintain the status quo as far as the authority of the Secretary.

Count III of the State's amended complaint calls upon the court to review the Secretary's construction of Title VIII of ANILCA. In *Chevron USA, Inc. v. Natural Resource Defense Council*, 467 U.S. 837, 843 (1983), the United States Supreme Court adopted a two-part test for evaluating agency construction of a statute. The court must first determine "whether Congress has directly spoken to the precise question at issue." *Id.* at 842. If, having employed the traditional tools of statutory construction, the court determines that the intent of Congress is clear, "that is the end of the matter; for the court, as well as the agency, must give effect to the unambiguously expressed intent of Congress." *Id.* at 842-43. In such situations, the court owes no particular deference to the administrators. The court must reject a statutory interpretation reached by administrative authorities that is contrary to the clearly expressed intent of Congress. *Id.* at n.9.

---

[27] Pub.L. No. 85-508 (72 Stat. 339), effective July 7, 1958.

[28] 16 U.S.C. § 3202(b).

If the court determines that Congress has not clearly stated its intention either by the express language of a statute or otherwise — that is, if the court determines that there is a gap in the statute —

> [T]he court does not simply impose its own construction on the statute, as would be necessary in the absence of an administrative interpretation. Rather, if the statute is silent or ambiguous with respect to the specific issue, the question for the court is whether the agency's answer is based on a permissible construction of the statute.

Id. at 843. The agency construction need not be the only possible interpretation, it must simply be a reasonable one.[29] *Id.* at 844.

It is difficult to square the Secretary's interpretation of Title VIII of ANILCA with the express language of these provisions. It is the Secretary's view that he must step in and implement ANILCA Section 804 following the failure of the state subsistence program implemented under ANILCA Section 805(d).[30] As discussed above, Congress has simply not enacted any express, direct authorization that the Secretary implement the rural preference and subsistence priority if the State does not do so.

As the United States Supreme Court makes clear in *Chevron*, the court may employ "traditional tools of statutory construction"[31] for the purpose of determining congressional

---

[29] The reasonableness test applies to agency action to fill statutory gaps which Congress has implicitly left to the agency. Where there is an explicit legislative delegation to the agency, an arbitrary or capricious test applies. No one contends that this is a case of explicit congressional delegation. Indeed, the State would seemingly not concede that there is any gap in this statute.

[30] 16 U.S.C. § 3115(d).

[31] *Chevron*, 467 U.S. at 837 n.9.

intent. The State and the court have looked to the legislative history of ANILCA which is voluminous.[32] The State provided an initial analysis of legislative history pertinent to the question before the court. The court was not satisfied with this initial analysis and conducted an independent evaluation of the legislative history. That evaluation was the subject of a preliminary order.[33] In this order, the court invited the parties to file supplemental briefs, which have been filed and have been considered by the court.

The court's final appraisal of the legislative history pertinent to the question of whether or not the Secretary has primary authority to implement ANILCA Section 804 in the absence of a state program is contained in an appendix attached to this decision. As detailed in the appendix, Congress started out with the proposition that the Secretary, and he alone, would manage a subsistence hunting and fishing program for rural Alaskans. Through the various legislative sessions, the role of the Secretary was consciously and intentionally reduced, and the role of the State was correspondingly increased. The State accurately points out that Congress expressly rejected a program wholly within the control of the Secretary.

It simply does not follow, however, that Congress intended that the State continue day-to-day management of fish and game for subsistence purposes, in the absence of a state law of general application sufficient to supersede ANILCA Sections 803 through 805. *See* ANILCA Section 805(d).[34] The court concludes that Congress unintentionally and inadvertently omitted an express provision authorizing the Secretary to implement Section 804 in the absence of a state program.

---

[32] This legislative history has been compiled and bound in 41 separate volumes, which take up nine feet of shelf space.

[33] Order re Motions for Summary Judgment on the "Who" Issue, filed November 22, 1993 (Clerk's Docket No. 163).

[34] 16 U.S.C. § 3115(d).

By ANILCA Section 814,[35] Congress expressly authorized the Secretary to promulgate, "such regulations as are necessary and appropriate to carry out his responsibilities under this [Title]." Congress having unequivocally given the Secretary regulatory authority, he was empowered to fill the statutory gap so as to implement not only the policy contained in ANILCA Section 802,[36] but also effect the substantive preference established by ANILCA Section 803[37] for rural Alaskans.

The final step in the analysis required by *Chevron* involves the question of whether or not the agency decision embodies a reasonable interpretation of the statute. In this instance, the Secretary's interpretation may be the only reasonable one which could follow the State's forced withdrawal from a qualifying subsistence program. Certainly implementation of ANILCA Section 804 by the Secretary through the creation of a Federal Subsistence Board was a reasonable response, even if it were not the only possible response to the failure of the state program. The State cannot say that the Board's initial regulations were unreasonable, for the Board in substance adopted the State's pre-*McDowell* subsistence program through temporary regulations. This action provided a smooth transition from state to federal management of the rural subsistence program for public (federal) lands.

The State has made a number of other arguments in support of its position. One of them is particularly intriguing. The State argues that, despite *McDowell*, it may voluntarily submit to the jurisdiction of this court for purposes of carrying out a qualifying subsistence program as to public (federal) lands. The State seems to argue that it can carry out such a program without doing violence to the Alaska Constitution as applied to subsistence

---

[35] 16 U.S.C. § 3124.

[36] 16 U.S.C. § 3112.

[37] 16 U.S.C. § 3113.

programs in *McDowell* so long as such program is effected through a court decree.[38]

What the State urges is problematic and is rejected for a number of reasons.

Firstly, the State is no longer in compliance with the requirements of Section 805(d),[39] and therefore federal court jurisdiction over any state program is very dubious. The court is unable to identify, and the State has not suggested, the source of power for a state fish and game regulator to take action to implement a rural Alaskan preference. Since *McDowell*, no state law may constitutionally authorize such. Even if that obstacle were overcome, what the State suggests smacks of a violation of the separation of powers doctrine.

Secondly, the State's proposal carefully avoids suggesting that the State would be enacting regulations. Rather, the State would seemingly have the court provide continuing supervision through court decrees which would serve as the subsistence program. ANILCA Section 805(d)[40] expressly contemplated a state program carried out through a "state rulemaking authority". ANILCA Section 807(a)[41] plainly contemplates court review of that state rule-making, and if the state regulations on a subject are found wanting, there is a requirement for the submission of replacement regulations for court approval and incorporation in a decree. This arrangement vests the court with jurisdiction to provide a standard judicial remedy: review of

---

[38] ANILCA Section 807(a), 16 U.S.C. § 3117(a), provides for federal court enforcement of a state subsistence program consistent with ANILCA Section 804, 16 U.S.C. § 3114, in federal court. No doubt for purposes of avoiding, Tenth Amendment difficulties, Section 807(a) reiterates that state programs are optional with the state, providing for federal court jurisdiction "if the State has fulfilled the requirements of Section 805(d)."

[39] 16 U.S.C. § 3115(d).

[40] 16 U.S.C. § 3115(d).

[41] 16 U.S.C. § 3117(a).

administrative rule-making. What the State suggests is that the court in substance become the rule-maker.

Thirdly, there is a substantial risk of state court litigation which could seek to prevent the state from doing by indirection what the Alaska Supreme Court has expressly found to be unconstitutional—a rural Alaskan preference. Although this subject was not developed by the parties, it is the view of the court that such a suit would likely be successful.

The court and, judging from the summary and background statements that preceded his temporary regulations,[42] the Secretary viewed the dual federal-state fish and game management situation as undesirable. It would be far preferable for there to be a unified, federally-qualified subsistence hunting and fishing program in the State of Alaska. One program would undoubtedly cost less, and would certainly be less complex in its implementation and operation. With that view before it, the court has seriously considered that sometimes situations must get worse before they get better, and a determination that Congress did not expressly (in ANILCA Section 805(a) through (c)) or impliedly authorize the Secretary to establish a subsistence hunting and fishing program in Alaska upon the failure of the state program, would certainly precipitate a crisis. Perhaps such a crisis would motivate either Congress or the state legislature to solve the problem which confronts all of us. However, the clarity of the congressional policy and purpose of ANILCA Title VIII, coupled with the clear grant of general regulatory power to the Secretary, convince the court that the position taken by the Secretary is both authorized and reasonable. The court cannot in good conscience reach the crisis-precipitating decision for which the State argues.

The court concludes that the Secretary, not the State of Alaska, is entitled to manage fish and game on public (federal) lands in Alaska for purposes of Title VIII of ANILCA. The

---

[42] 55 Fed. Reg. 27,114 (June 29, 1990).

State's motion for partial summary judgment[43] on Count III of its amended complaint is denied; and the court, on its on motion, concludes that the contentions contained in said Count IIII are without merit and subject to dismissal.

II.

Where Does ANILCA Apply?

The first issue has to do with "who" is entitled to regulate. The second issue addressed by this decision has frequently been referred to by the parties as the "where" issue. Assuming that the Secretary does have jurisdiction over the day-to-day management of fish and game for subsistence purposes, the parties disagree as to what lands are subject to the Secretary's regulation.

In their second amended complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief,[44] plaintiffs Katie John, Doris Charles, and the Village Council of Mentasta (the "plaintiffs") contend for their first cause of action that the waters of Tanada Creek and the Copper River are "public lands" as defined by Section 102[45] of ANILCA. First by temporary regulations (55 Fed. Reg. 27,114 (June 29, 1990)), and, more recently, by permanent regulations (57 Fed. Reg. 22,940 (May 29, 1992)), the Secretary has taken the position that navigable waters within the State of Alaska are not "public lands" for purposes of ANILCA. For purposes of this case, it is undisputed that the fishing site which is the subject of Katie John's complaint is on navigable waters.

The plaintiffs have moved for summary judgment on the "where" or "public lands" issue.[46] The federal defendants have responded with motions to dismiss or, in the alternative for

---

[43] Clerk's Docket No. 113.

[44] Clerk's Docket No. 106.

[45] 16 U.S.C. § 3102. For convenience and ease of reference, 16 U.S.C. § 3102 is hereafter referred to as "Section 102".

[46] Clerk's Docket No. 48.

summary judgment.[47] The State of Alaska, co-defendant with the federal defendants as to the Katie John complaint, also move to dismiss the plaintiff's claim.[48] These motions are all opposed. Here again, the court has invited parties to the jointly managed cases to take a position on the public lands issue, and some have done so. The court has heard oral argument.

Background

The site which has formed the basis for development of the "where" issue is near a fish camp situated at the confluence of Tanada Creek and the Copper River and is within the boundaries of Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve. This camp was once the location of a village known as "Batzulnetas". The village was abandoned in the early 1940's but a subsistence fishery continued there for many years.

Tanada Creek is a part of the Copper River system. Approximately 120 known sockeye and other salmon stocks ascend the Copper River system each year. The fish stocks mix with one another, and at a given time some twenty or more stocks may be migrating up the river. The Copper River sockeye stocks are harvested commercially near the mouth of the Copper River.

In 1964, the Alaska Board of Fish and Game closed Batzulnetas to fishing with nets and fishwheels. In 1984, Katie John and Doris Charles submitted a proposal to the Alaska State Board of Fisheries requesting that the Batzulnetas area be opened to subsistence fishing. The proposal was denied.

In 1985, plaintiffs filed a law suit against the State (*Katie John v. State of Alaska*, No. A85-0698-CV (D. Alaska) (hereinafter "*Katie John I*")) under ANILCA Section 807(a).[49] The suit resulted in informal negotiations between the parties and an

---

[47] Clerk's Docket Nos. 2, 17, and 121.

[48] Clerk's Docket Nos. 38 and 124.

[49] 16 U.S.C. § 3117(a).

agreement to allow a limited fishery at Batzulnetas. In 1988, the Alaska Board of Fisheries adopted a regulation that allowed limited fishing at the Batzulnetas site. 5 AAC § 01.647(i).

In 1989, in continuation of *Katie John I*, the plaintiffs sought preliminary relief from the regulation that limited fishing at Batzulnetas. In June of 1989, this court issued a preliminary injunction that allowed full-time fishing at Batzulnetas from June 1 through September 1, or, in the alternative, until 1,000 sockeye were taken. Order, June 6, 1989 (No. A85-0698-CV).

In January of 1990, this court invalidated the 1988 regulation (5 AAC § 01.647(i)) and ordered the Alaska State Board of Fisheries to promulgate regulations that established a subsistence fishing priority at Batzulnetas. Before the State had an opportunity to promulgate such regulations, the Alaska Supreme Court decided *McDowell*.[50] As a result of *McDowell*, the State was no longer in compliance with ANILCA, and the regulation of subsistence fishing on "public lands" in the State of Alaska was taken over by the Secretary. In order to quickly fill the regulatory void left by McDowell, the Federal Subsistence Board adopted temporary regulations on June 29, 1990. The temporary regulations were essentially the same as the state regulations that this court declared invalid in *Katie John I*.

On September 7, 1990, plaintiffs petitioned the Federal Subsistence Board for reconsideration of the temporary regulations that applied to subsistence fishing at Batzulnetas. After considering plaintiffs' motion for reconsideration, the Federal Subsistence Board concluded that the temporary regulations were not applicable to the Batzulnetas fishery and that management of the fisheries remained with the State. This decision was based upon an administrative determination of the National Park Service that the waters of Tanada Creek and Copper River in the vicinity of Batzulnetas are navigable. The Federal Subsistence

---

[50] See discussion at pages 7 to 9 hereof for a more complete discussion of what followed the *McDowell* decision.

Board informed the Plaintiffs that the temporary federal regulations only apply to "public lands"[51] and that navigable waters do not fall with the definition of "public lands". 50 C.F.R. § 100.3(b). On December 5, 1990, the plaintiffs filed a complaint against the United States of America and the Secretary. The action was again brought pursuant to ANILCA Section 807(a).[52] Plaintiffs state four causes of action, but only the first and second and the fourth are relevant to the issues now before this court.[53]

In the first cause of action, plaintiffs allege that the federal defendants are required to provide a subsistence fishery at Batzulnetas and that their refusal to do so is in violation of Title VIII of ANILCA. Plaintiffs base the first cause of action on ANILCA Section 804[54] which provides a priority for the taking of fish and game for non-wasteful subsistence purposes on public lands. Plaintiffs allege that the reserved water rights doctrine and the navigational servitude in Alaska waters provide the United States with an interest in the waters of Tanada Creek and Copper River, and that these waters therefore fall within the definition of "public lands" as defined by ANILCA Section 102.

In the second cause of action, the plaintiffs allege that when the United States set aside land for plaintiffs under the Alaska Native Allotment Act of 1906, it also reserved sufficient water to fulfill the purposes of the allotments. Plaintiffs assert that such reserved water rights are interests to which the United States holds title, and thus presents an alternative reason why the waters of Tanada Creek are public lands.

---

51 ANILCA Section 102, 16 U.S.C. § 3102.

52 16 U.S.C. § 3117(a).

53 In the third cause of action, the plaintiffs claim that the federal defendants (through the National Park Service) have precluded the plaintiffs from obtaining reasonable access to Batzulnetas via "the Batzulnetas trail". This issue is not the subject of the pending motions.

54 16 U.S.C. § 3114.

In the fourth cause of action, the plaintiffs allege that the State of Alaska has no jurisdiction over the waters of Tanada Creek and the Copper River as regards subsistence fishing since they are "public lands" as defined in ANILCA.

Accordingly, the plaintiffs request rulings that the waters of Tanada Creek and the Copper River are "public lands"; that the Secretary's refusal to provide for a subsistence fishery at Batzulnetas is a restriction of a subsistence use, contrary to Title VIII of ANILCA; that the federal defendants be ordered to promulgate regulations that provide for subsistence fishing at Batzulnetas; and that the State of Alaska has no jurisdiction to manage subsistence uses of fish in the waters of Copper River and Tanada Creek.

What Constitutes "Public Lands" under *Title VIII of ANILCA*?

ANILCA Section 102 provides a three-tier definition of "public lands":

> As used in this Act ...
>
> (1) The term "land" means lands, *waters, and interests therein.*
>
> (2) The term "Federal land" means lands the *title to which is in the United States* after December 2, 1980.
>
> (3) The term "public lands" means land situated in Alaska which, after December 2, 1980 ... are Federal lands....

(Emphasis supplied.)

When the Secretary of the Interior took over management of the subsistence uses of fish and wildlife on public lands in June of 1990, he issued regulations that excluded all navigable waters in Alaska from the definition of public lands, and thus from the ambit of Title VIII.[55] Plaintiffs' complaint is a direct

[55] The final regulation adopted by the Secretary of the Interior reads:

challenge of this regulation. To resolve this challenge, we must evaluate the Secretary's interpretation of ANILCA Section 102. We follow the procedure and authorities discussed above[56] in doing so.

Congress did not define the terms "interests" or "title" in the definition of "public lands" in ANILCA, nor did it make any reference to the common law doctrines of reserved water rights or navigational servitude. The parties have not unearthed any legislative history indicating that Congress considered these doctrines when it defined the term "public lands". Since Congress has not specifically defined the terms "interests" or "title", the court's first task is to determine what kind of authority Congress gave the federal defendants, as this will fix the degree of deference which the court must give to the federal defendants' interpretation of ANILCA Section 102.

Where the governing statute contains an express delegation of legislative authority over a specific provision, Congress has in effect instructed the agency to engage in a deliberative process requiring the agency to weigh costs, benefits, and other competing interests, and arrive at a value judgment.

Hence, judicial review of such legislative determinations is at its narrowest, asking only if the agency action were arbitrary and capricious. *See, Schweiker v. Gray Panthers*, 453 U.S. 34 (1981); *Mercy Hospital of Laredo v. Heckler*, 777 F.2d 1028 (5th Cir.1985). An express delegation must be clear from the terms of the statute. *See, e.g., Batterton v. Francis*, 432 U.S. 416 (1976) (where the Secretary of Health, Education and

---

(b)The regulations contained in subpart D apply on all public lands including all non-navigable waters located on these lands.

Fed. Reg. 22,951 (May 29, 1992); *see also* 50 C.F.R. § 100.3(b). The Secretary of Agriculture adopted identical parallel regulations at 6 C.F.R. § 242.3(b).

[56] See pages 14 to 16 hereof.

Welfare was directed by statute to define the term "unemployment" in a provision of the Social Security Act).

ANILCA contains no such express delegation of legislative authority regarding the definition of "public lands". However, Section 102 contains an implicit delegation of power to the federal defendants.

Congress has created a program which necessarily requires the formulation of policy in order to fill a gap left by Congress. *Morton v. Ruiz*, 415 U.S. 199, 231 (1974). Section 814[57] directs the Secretary to promulgate "such regulations as are necessary and appropriate to carry out his responsibilities under this [Title]." Whether the federal government holds title to an interest in a specific plot of land or column of water will depend on how "interests" and "title" are defined. Without such further definition, the term "public lands" is ambiguous. Since these terms must be fleshed out in order for the Secretary to administer ANILCA, the Secretary necessarily has the authority to make such a determination. Consequently, the Secretary's interpretation of "public lands" is reviewed under a reasonableness standard. *Chevron*, 476 U.S. at 844.

Although the Secretary received extensive comments regarding its proposed construction of the scope of Title VIII, the Secretary's rule was not accompanied by any legal analysis and merely stated in a conclusory fashion that public lands do not include navigable waterways:

> Numerous comments were received concerning the definitions of Federal lands and public lands. All of these comments focused on the issue of jurisdiction over fisheries in navigable waters. Many felt that the definitions should include navigable waters to protect subsistence use and the subsistence priority. They strongly believe it was Congress' intent to protect

---

[57] 16 U.S.C. § 3124.

subsistence rights as broadly as possible. Additionally, many individuals commented that most subsistence resources are found in navigable waters.

The scope of these regulations is limited by the definition of public lands, which is found in section 102 of ANILCA and which only involves lands, waters, and interests therein title to which is in the United States. Because the United States does not generally own title to the submerged lands beneath navigable waters in Alaska, the public lands definition in ANILCA and these regulations generally excludes navigable waters.

Consequently, neither ANILCA nor these regulations apply generally to subsistence uses on navigable waters. However, based upon specific pre-Statehood reservations of submerged lands, § ___, 3(b) establishes that these regulations apply to navigable waters located on the identified public lands. The listed areas remain subject to change through further rule-making pending a review and determination of pre-Statehood reservations by the United States.

57 Fed. Reg. 22,940 at 22,942 (May 29, 1992).[58]

---

[58] The above quoted language is the Secretary's current form of his decision with respect to whether public lands are navigable waterways. Originally, the Secretary's explanation was as follows:

> There were many comments on the exclusion of navigable waters from the definition of public lands. Some comments regarding the exclusion of State-selected and Native-selected lands in the definition were received also. There was a great deal of concern that the exclusion of navigable waters eliminated the majority of subsistence fishing, critical to the well-being of rural communities. Some concerns were expressed also that the sport take of migratory species on State lands affects their numbers for subsistence purposes on public lands.

The plaintiffs argue that the term "public lands" in Section 102 should include all waters in which the United States has an interest by virtue of the reserved water rights doctrine and the navigational servitude. The court's task is to determine whether the Secretary's exclusion of these doctrines from his interpretation of Section 102 was reasonable. Each of the plaintiff's contentions will be examined in turn.

Reserved Water Rights Doctrine

Reservation of water rights is empowered by the Commerce Clause (U.S. Const. art. I, § 8) and the Property Clause (U.S. Const. art. I, § 3). The doctrine applies to federal enclaves, encompassing water rights in navigable and nonnavigable streams. When the federal government withdraws its land from the public domain and reserves it for a federal purpose, the government by implication reserves appurtenant water then unappropriated to the extent needed to accomplish the purpose of the reservation. The reserved water rights doctrine reserves only that amount of water necessary to fulfill the purposes of the reservation, no more. *Cappaert v. United States*, 426 U.S. 128, 138 (1976).

> The United States generally does not hold title to navigable waters and thus navigable waters generally are not included within the definition of public lands. Navigable waters are those waters used or susceptible of being used in their ordinary condition as highways for commerce over which trade and travel are or may be conducted in the customary modes of trade and travel on water.
>
> The scope of these regulation is limited by the definition of public lands in section 102 of ANILCA. Lands validly selected by the State or Native corporations are therefore excluded from this public lands definition.

Temporary Regulation, 55 Fed. Reg. 27,114 at 27,115 (June 29, 1990).

The court perceives no significant difference between the two texts.

The parties do not dispute that the federal government reserved certain water appurtenant to the Wrangell -Saint Elias National Park when it was established by ANILCA in 1980. Congress clearly stated the purposes for which this park was created:

> To maintain unimpaired the scenic beauty and quality of high mountain peaks, foothills, glacial systems, lakes, and streams, valleys, and coastal landscapes in their natural state; to protect habitat for, and populations of, fish and wildlife including but not limited to caribou, brown/grizzly bears, Dall sheep, moose, wolves, trumpeter swans and other waterfowl, and marine mammals; and to provide continued opportunities, including reasonable access for mountain climbing, mountaineering, and other wilderness recreational activities. *Subsistence uses by local residents shall be permitted in the park, where such uses are traditional, in accordance with [the provisions of Title VIII].*

Section 201(9), 16 U.S.C. § 410hh(9) (emphasis added). Applying the *Cappaert* analysis, it is clear that an unquantified amount of water appurtenant to the park was reserved for the purpose of providing rural Alaskans with the opportunity to pursue their subsistence rights under Title VIII.

The court declines to use the reserved water rights doctrine as a means of determining the geographic scope of the Title VIII. Although the court does not reject the notion that the reserved water rights doctrine could have some application in this case, or that it could be of primary importance in a subsistence case in some other location in Alaska, the court concludes that the geographic scope of Title VIII is better determined by use of the navigational servitude, as being more compatible with the findings[59] and Policies[60] of Title VIII of ANILCA.

---

[59] ANILCA Section 801, 16 U.S.C. § 3111.

[60] ANILCA Section 802, 16 U.S.C. § 3112.

Navigational Servitude

Although both are grounded in the Commerce Clause, the federal navigational servitude is distinct from Congress's [sic] power to regulate navigable waterways. *Boone v. United States*, 944 F.2d 1489, 1493 (9th Cir. 1983), *citing Kaiser Aetna v. United States*, 444 U.S. 164, 173. Congress' authority to regulate waterways extends beyond waters that are navigable in fact,[61] and is as broad as the needs of commerce. *Boone*, 944 F.2d at 1493.

By contrast, the navigational servitude is described as a "dominant servitude" and a "superior navigation easement". *Id.* at 1493-94. The purpose of the navigational servitude is to relieve the government of the obligation to compensate an owner of riparian, littoral, or submerged lands for acts which normally require compensation under the Fifth Amendment. *Id.* at 1494. The Ninth Circuit has explained the difference in the geographic scope of these two concepts:

> The navigational servitude, unlike the power to regulate navigable waters under the commerce clause, is not coextensive with Congress' regulatory authority. First, unlike Congress' power to regulate waters for purposes of navigation, the navigational servitude "does not extend beyond the high-water mark" of navigable streams. *Rands*, 389 U.S. at 122, 88 S.Ct. at 266; *see also Kansas City Life Ins.*, 339 U.S. at 808, 70 S.Ct. at 890, *United States v. Willow River Co.*, 324 U.S. 499, 509, 65 S.Ct. 761, 767, 89 L.Ed. 1101

---

[61] Congress has the power under the Commerce Clause to regulate waterways that are navigable in fact, *The Daniel Ball*, 77 U.S. 557, 563 (1870); non-navigable tributaries, *United States v. Grand River Dam Authority*, 363 U.S. 229, 232 (1960); waters which were once navigable in fact but are no longer so, *Arizona v. California*, 283 U.S. 423, 453-54 (1931); and waters which may be made navigable by reasonable improvements, *United States v. Appalachian Electric Power*, 311 U.S. 377, 407-409 (1940).

(1945). Thus, although the commerce clause power to regulate navigable waters permits, for example, regulatory authority over the non-navigable tributaries of streams, *see United States v. Grand River Dam Authority*, 363 U.S. 229, 232, 80 S.Ct. 1134, 1136, 4 L.Ed.2d 1186 (1960), the navigational servitude would not cover the same tributaries, *see United States v. Cress*, 243 U.S. 316, 326-27, 37 S.Ct. 380, 384, 61 L.Ed. 746 (1917), *Goose Creek Hunting Club, Inc. v. United States*, 518 F.2d 579, 582, 207 Ct.Cl. 323 (1975).

Second, the determination of navigability, is different in different contexts. *Kaiser Aetna*, 444 U.S. at 171, 100 S.Ct. at 388. A waterway may be subject to the navigational servitude if it is navigable in fact in its natural state. *Kaiser Aetna*, 444 U.S. at 175, 100 S.Ct. at 390, *Cress*, 243 U.S. at 322-3, 37 S.Ct. at 382-83. Waterways are navigable in fact "'when they are used, or are susceptible of being used, *in their ordinary condition*, as highways of commerce.'" *Cress*, 243 U.S. at 323, 37 S.Ct. at 383 (quoting *The Daniel Ball*, 77 U.S. (10 Wall.) 557, 563, 19 L.Ed. 999 (1870) (emphasis in *Cress*)). By contrast, as explained above, navigability for purposes of the commerce clause authority to legislate, has been expanded to include both waterways once navigable but no longer so, and waterways never navigable but which may become so with reasonable improvements. *See Appalachian Electric*, 311 U.S. at 408, 61 S.Ct. at 299. Under this broad view of navigability, "[t]heoretically at least, there are no waters in the United States immune from [the power to regulate] navigation." Morreale, *supra*, at 9.

Id. at 1495-96 (footnotes omitted). The parties in this case frame the issue as whether the navigational servitude creates only a usufructuary right in the federal government (federal and state position) or a property interest to which the federal government holds title (plaintiffs' position). While this formulation of the "where" issue is not inappropriate, it is broader than necessary. The parties tend to focus on abstractions: what is land or an interest in land, and what is title to an interest in land? At the end of this discussion, we will focus more narrowly upon ANILCA Section 102 which includes in public lands interests in "waters" and upon the purpose of Title VIII of ANILCA.

The federal defendants cite *City of Angoon v. Hodel*, 803 F.2d 1016 (9th Cir. 1986), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 870 (1987), for the proposition that the United States does not hold title to the navigational servitude. *Angoon* involved a conveyance of land on Admiralty Island to a Native corporation under ANCSA. The Native corporation planned to harvest timber on the land. The City of Angoon sought an injunction to prevent the harvest, and objected that a subsistence evaluation required by ANILCA Section 810[62] had not been prepared. Section 810 of ANILCA applies only if the land at issue is "public land". Although the harvest would take place only on land owned by the Native corporation, the City of Angoon argued that this use of corporation lands would affect subsistence uses on public lands, thus triggering application of Section 810. *Id.* at 1027. The Ninth Circuit rejected this broad reading of "public lands" and held that Section 810 did not apply. In a footnote, the Ninth Circuit addressed the City of Angoon's argument that "the EPA's and Corps' granting of permits under sections 402 and 404 of the Clean Water Act . . . required a section 810 subsistence evaluation because these determinations used 'public land': namely, a navigational servitude." *Id.* at 1027-28, n.6. The Ninth Circuit rejected this argument:

---

[62] 16 U.S.C. § 3120.

> "Public land" is defined to include all interests in land in which the United States holds title. ANILCA § 102(1)-(2), 16 U.S.C. § 3102(1)-(2). Since the United States does not hold title to the navigational servitude, the servitude is not "public land" within the meaning of ANILCA. *See United States v. Virginia Elec. & Power Co.*, 365 U.S. 624, 627-28, 81 S.Ct. 784, 787-88, 5 L.Ed.2d 838 (1961) (servitude is "power of government to control and regulate navigable waters in the interest of commerce") (quoting *United States v. Commodore Park*, 324 U.S. 386, 390, 65 S.Ct. 803, 805, 89 L.Ed. 1017 (1945)). For similar reasons, the Secretary was not required to perform a section 810 evaluation prior to transferring the Cube Cove lands to Shee Atika. Cube Cove is simply not "public land." *See* ANILCA §§ 102(3)(B) and 810(c), 16 U.S.C. §§ 3102(3)(B) and 3120(c).

Id. The state defendants treat this language as dispositive of the issue before this court. However, in *Angoon* the issues were very different from those in this case. *Angoon* did not involve the scope of federal and state management of fish, nor did it address the subtleties regarding the terms "interests" or "title" presented by this case. The Ninth Circuit's observation in *Angoon*, that the United States does not hold title to the navigational servitude, appears to be premised on the conclusion that the servitude is a "power of government" rather than a property interest. *Angoon* contains no analysis of the character of the navigational servitude.

Five years after *Angoon* was decided, the Ninth Circuit had occasion to analyze in detail the genesis and scope of the navigational servitude, and it concluded that it does consist of a property interest. *Boone v. United States*, 944 F.2d 1489 (9th Cir. 1991), was a dispute over access to a lagoon in Hawaii. The United States contended that members of the public had the right

to boat on the lagoon by virtue of the government's navigational servitude. The owners of the land surrounding the lagoon sought a declaration that the lagoon was not navigable and that they could therefore deny access to the public. The district court found that the lagoon was not navigable and entered judgment for the owners. In the course of describing the history and character of the navigational servitude, the Ninth Circuit commented:

> The label, "servitude," implies a property interest. How a constitutional grant of authority to Congress creates such an interest is explained in *United States v. Twin City Power Co.*, 350 U.S. 222, 76 S.Ct. 259, 100 L.Ed. 240 (1956). The Court stated:
>
> "The interest of the United States in the flow of a navigable stream originates in the Commerce Clause. That Clause speaks in terms of power, not of property. But the power is a dominant one which can be asserted to the exclusion of any competing or conflicting one. The power is a privilege which we have called 'a dominant servitude,' or 'a superior navigational easement.'"

Id. at 224-25, 76 S.Ct. at 261 (citations omitted).

Boone, 944 F.2d at 1494, n.9. The Ninth Circuit's subsequent, and more thorough analysis of the character of the navigational servitude establishes, contrary to the comment in *Angoon*, that the servitude is not always accurately described as just a power. For purposes of ANILCA Title VIII, the navigational servitude is more properly characterized as an interest in waters. ANILCA Section 102 addresses interests in *both* "lands" and "waters".

The plaintiffs also argue that the Ninth Circuit's observation in *Angoon* is drawn into doubt by a subsequent Supreme Court decision, *Amoco Production Co. v. Hodel*, 480 U.S. 531

(1987). In *Amoco*, ANILCA Section 810 was once again used to challenge the action of a federal agency. The Secretary of the Interior granted oil and gas leases to oil companies off the coast of Alaska. The plaintiffs (Native villages and corporations) challenged the Secretary's failure to follow the requirements of Section 810 of ANILCA. The Supreme Court concluded that the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) is not "public land" as defined in ANILCA. According to Section 102, "public lands" must be within the boundaries of the State of Alaska. The boundaries of the State of Alaska are delineated by its coastal waters which extend three miles from its coastline and end where the OCS commences.

In *Amoco*, as in *Angoon* and *Boone*, the issue on which we now focus was relegated to a footnote. The Secretary of the Interior had argued in the alternative that the United States did not hold title to the OCS. The Supreme Court indicated that Section 102 did not require fee title to be held by the United States in order for a tract to be "public land":

> The United States may not hold "title" to the submerged lands of the OCS, but we hesitate to conclude that the United States does not have "title" to any "interests therein." Certainly, it is not clear that Congress intended to exclude the OCS by defining public lands as "lands, waters, and interests therein" "the title to which is in the United States." We also reject the assertion that the phrase "public lands," in and of itself, has a precise meaning, without reference to a definitional section or its context in a statute.

Id. at 548-49, n. 15 (citation omitted). The plaintiffs argue that since the Supreme Court reads the term "title" expansively, footnote 6 of *Angoon* has no further validity.

Footnote 15 in *Amoco* is a clear signal that the term "title" in Section 102 can refer to something less than technical fee title. This result was suggested, indeed we think required, because

Section 102(1) of ANILCA expressly defines "lands" as including "interests" in both "lands" and "waters". Footnote 9 of *Boone*, and the cases cited therein, reinforce the proposition that the United States may be considered to own an "interest" in property by virtue of the navigational servitude. The court concludes that, for purposes of Title VIII of ANILCA, the United States holds title to an interest in the navigable waters of Alaska.

The court also concludes that the Secretary's construction of Section 102 was not reasonable because his interpretation of "interests" in "waters" and "title" was too narrow. The court does not reach this conclusion solely upon the basis of the foregoing authority. The court has given equal consideration to whether the position taken by the Secretary does or does not advance the congressional purpose and policy of ANILCA, which are found in ANILCA Sections 101(c) and 802(1).[63]

---

[63] ANILCA Section 101(c), 16 U.S.C. § 3101(c), provides:

> It is further the intent and purpose of this Act consistent with management of fish and wildlife in accordance with recognized scientific principles and the purposes for which each conservation system unit is established, designated, or expanded by or pursuant to this Act, to provide the opportunity for rural residents engaged in a subsistence way of life to continue to do so.

ANILCA Section 802(1), 16 U.S.C. § 3112(1), provides:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that—
>
> (1)consistent with sound management principles, and the conservation of healthy populations of fish and wildlife, the utilization of the public lands in Alaska is to cause the least adverse impact possible on rural residents who depend upon subsistence uses of the resources of such lands; consistent with management of fish and wildlife in accordance with recognized scientific principles and the purposes of each unit established, designated, or expanded by or pursuant to titles II through VII of this Act, the purpose of this subchapter is to provide the opportunity for rural residents engaged in a subsistence way of life to do so[.]

Section 802 (§ 3112) is quoted in full at pages 4 to 5 hereof.

By limiting the scope of Title VIII to non-navigable waterways, the Secretary has, to a large degree, thwarted Congress' intent to provide the opportunity for rural residents engaged in a subsistence way of life to continue to do so. Much subsistence fishing and much of the best fishing is in the large navigable waterways where one has access to the most fish as opposed to the smaller tributaries or lakes where, for example, salmon go to spawn. The Tanada Creek subsistence fishery is at Batzulnetas, at the confluence of the Copper River and Tanada Creek, not far upstream in some non-navigable tributary. Fish, salmon in particular, mature on the high seas. They spawn in the shallows of far upland creeks and lakes which are reached only after passing the gauntlet of commercial fisheries in the territorial seas (especially in Prince William Sound insofar as the Copper River is concerned) and sport and Alaska's wide open subsistence fishing on the entire Copper River. The food quality of salmon is substantially degraded by the time these fish reach the spawning grounds. By the regulations which excluded navigable waters from the jurisdiction of the Federal Subsistence Board, the Secretary abandoned to the non-consistent[64] state subsistence program the largest and most productive waters used by rural Alaskans who have a subsistence lifestyle.

As additional grounds for its ruling, the court notes that Congress specifically invoked its constitutional authority under the commerce clause "to protect and provide the opportunity for continued subsistence uses" when it enacted Title VIII.[65] Thus, even if the navigational servitude is viewed as a power to regulate rather than a property interest, Congress exercised that power to protect subsistence uses by rural Alaskans.

Conclusion

The court concludes that the Secretary, not the State of Alaska, is entitled to manage fish and wildlife on public lands

---

[64] See ANILCA Section 805(d), 16 U.S.C. § 3115(d).

[65] ANILCA Section 801(4), 16 U.S.C. § 3111(4).

in Alaska for purposes of Title VIII of ANILCA. The State's motion for partial summary judgment[66] on Count III of its amended complaint is denied. Count III is dismissed.

The court further concludes that the Secretary's interpretation of Section 102 is unreasonable. For purposes of Title VIII, "public lands" includes all navigable waterways in Alaska. The federal defendants' motions to dismiss the plaintiffs complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief, or in the alternative for summary judgment (Clerk's Docket Nos. 2, 17, and 121) are denied. The State of Alaska's motions to dismiss or for summary judgment (Clerk's Docket Nos. 38 and 124) are denied. The plaintiffs motion for partial summary judgment (Clerk's Docket No. 48) is granted.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 30 day of March, 1994.

/s/
United States District Judge

APPENDIX

An examination of the legislative history of Title VIII reveals the following evolution in Congressional policy.

The initial House bill sponsored by Congressman Udall (H.R. 39, Jan. 4, 1977, Vol. 1 at 204, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Legislative History of ANILCA),[1] specifically provided that the Secretary of the Interior would manage subsistence uses of fish and game on Alaska's public lands by issuing regulations on seasons and bag limits. ADFG, Vol. 1 at 222-231.

Next, the House Interior Committee proposed amendments that narrowed the Secretary's role by allowing the State of Alaska to manage subsistence uses on public lands. However, the amendments specifically stated that the Secretary could

---

[66] Clerk's Docket No. 113.

[1] Hereinafter "ADFG, Vol. ____ at ____".

suspend the State's management and take over such management if he determined that the State's program did not comply with the subsistence preference in Title VIII (then Title VII). House Interior Committee Report, April 7, 1978, ADFG, Vol. 33 at 32-38, 186-192, 237-240.

The House Merchant Marine Committee then proposed that the Secretary's role should be limited even further. Federal regulation of subsistence uses of fish and wildlife on public lands was eliminated; the burden of all such regulation fell on the State. If the State's program did not comply with the federal subsistence preference, the Secretary was authorized to close the public lands to consumptive uses while the State redrafted its regulations. House Merchant Marine Committee Report, May 4, 1978, ADFG, Vol. 33 at 417, 496, 509-515. The House passed a version of ANILCA on May 23, 1978, that included the House Merchant Marine Committee's version of Title VIII (VII). ADFG, Vol. 2 at 419, 512-539.

The Senate Energy Committee issued a report on October 9, 1978. The Energy Committee revised the structure of Title VIII and inserted a judicial enforcement provision, Section 807, in place of the Secretary's closure authority. Under the proposed Section 807, the Secretary was to act as an advocate in federal court on behalf of parties aggrieved by the State's failure to provide for the subsistence preference, in specific instances.

Section 807 is meant to provide a mechanism to rectify individual instances of the State's non-compliance with Title VIII. Previous House versions allowed the Secretary to step in and promulgate a regulation addressing a need in a particular time and place when he determined that the applicable state regulation did not comport with Title VIII. The initial version of Section 807 authorized the Secretary to obtain a court decree on behalf of an aggrieved party that would direct the State to promulgate a new regulation. The Senate Committee Report described the genesis of Section 807 as follows:

The subsistence management provisions of H.R. 39 as passed by the House of Representatives reflect a delicate balance between the traditional responsibility of the State of Alaska for the regulation of fish and wildlife populations within the State and the responsibility of the Federal government for the attainment of national interest goals, including the protection of the traditional lifestyle and culture of Alaska Natives. Although the committee has adopted a subsistence management system similar in concept to the House approach, after careful consideration the committee has modified the Federal-State relationship in a number of important respects.

Section 704 of the House bill requires the State to develop and implement a subsistence management program which includes a regionalized regulatory system for the management of fish and wildlife on the public lands for subsistence uses, and laws or regulations which provide preference for nonwasteful subsistence uses by local residents consumptive uses of fish and wildlife on the public lands. The State regulations must further provide preference for subsistence uses shall be based upon local residency, customary and direct dependence upon such populations as the mainstay of livelihood and the availability of alternative resources. The committee determined that inclusion of these requirements as part of a federally mandated State program is an unnecessary intrusion into traditional State responsibility for fish and wildlife management. Consequently, the committee retained both of these requirements in sections 804 and 805 respectively, but has eliminated the requirement that they be included as part of a formal State program.

> Section 705(c) of the House bill requires the Secretary to take certain administrative action if he determines that the State has failed to establish a subsistence program or to implement such a program in an manner which adequately satisfies the preference for subsistence uses. While the committee has retained broad Federal guidelines to ensure the adequate implementation of the subsistence preference on the public lands and the Secretary's ongoing responsibility to monitor the States's implementation of such preference, the Committee believe that the responsibility of the Secretary to ensure the protection of subsistence uses and the satisfaction of subsistence needs of Alaska Natives and other rural residents can best be met by providing legal representation for such residents before the United States District Court in appropriate instances in which the Secretary has determined, after consultation with the State, that the State has not timely or adequately provided for the preference for subsistence uses. Although it is the intent of the committee to neither enlarge nor diminish any existing authority of the Secretary to take appropriate administrative action to protect subsistence uses and satisfy subsistence needs of rural residents of Alaska, the committee believes that the responsibilities and authorities of the Secretary and the United States District Court set forth in section 804-807 ensure the protection of subsistence activities and the discharge of Federal responsibilities.

Sen. Rep. No. 95-1300 at 196-7, 95th Cong. 2d Sess. (1978).

While the above quoted legislative history specifically defines the Secretary's function when the State's regulations fail to comply with Title VIII in specific instances, it does not give the State and Federal regulators any guidance as to their respec-

tive roles should the State's entire subsistence program be declared illegal.

The initial version of Section 807 also provided that the Secretary would monitor the State's administration of its program (Section 806), and that the Secretary would establish regional advisory councils if the State failed to do so (Section 805). The Secretary also retained his traditional authority to manage public lands by regulating access and wildlife habitats. ADFG, Vol. 33 at 555, 582-588, 751-753, 775-786, 841, 987-988.

H.R. 39 referred to the House in the 96th Congress and the House Interior Committee issued a report on April 18, 1979, in which it adopted the Senate Committee's version of Title VIII (VII). ADFG, Vol. 34 at 1, 56-66, 145, 239-241. A group of dissenters presented additional views which further demonstrated that the Secretary's duties had been reduced from its original function as sole regulator. *Id.* at 389, 546-556. The House Merchant Marine Committee issued a report on April 23, 1979, that echoed the Senate Energy and House Interior Committee's conclusions. ADFG, Vol. 35 at 1, 43-49, 161-164. The House passed this version of ANILCA on May 16, 1979.

The Senate Energy Committee issued the final committee report on ANILCA on November 14, 1979. The judicial enforcement provision still required the Secretary to act as an advocate for parties aggrieved by the State's failure to provide for the subsistence preference, in specific instances. ADFG, Vol. 35 at 271, 308-314. This version of ANILCA was passed by the Senate on August 19, 1980, and was referred to the House in November of 1980.

The final amendments to Title VIII were made by Concurrent Resolutions 452 and 453 only days before ANILCA became law on December 2, 1980.[2] Senator Stevens submitted a prepared document as legislative history of the changes, which was printed in the Congressional Record. ADFG, Vol. 39 at 155-

158. The amendment to Section 807 eliminated the Secretary's role as advocate in federal court and substituted a private right of action for parties aggrieved by the State's failure to provide for the subsistence preference. Representative Udall submitted the concurrent resolutions in the House. *Id.* at 499-501. This eleventh-hour revision to Section 807 became law with the passage of ANILCA on December 2, 1980.

---

[2] Congressman Udall lodged a detailed discussion of the pending bill in the Congressional Record on November 12, 1980. ADFG, Vol. 39, at 133-151. See discussion of Title VIII, *id.* at 145-149.

STATE of Alaska, Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

Bruce BABBITT, Secretary of the Interior, et al.,
Defendants-Appellees.

Katie John, et al.,
Plaintiffs-Appellees,

v.

United States of America, et al., Defendants-Appellants.

Nos. 94-35480, 94-35481.

United States Court of Appeals,

Ninth Circuit.

Argued and Submitted Feb. 8, 1995.

Filed April 20, 1995.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Alaska H. Russel Holland, District Judge, Presiding.

Joanne M. Grace, Assistant Attorney General, Anchorage, Alaska; for the plaintiff-appellant-plaintiffs-appellees.

Elizabeth Ann Peterson, United States Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., for the defendants-appellees-defendants- appellants;

Robert T. Anderson, Native American Rights Fund, Anchorage, Alaska, defendant-appellee-plaintiff-appellee.

Before WRIGHT, HALL and WIGGINS, Circuit Judges.

WRIGHT, Circuit Judge.

*1 These appeals arise from the efforts of Katie John, Doris Charles and the other upper Ahtna Athabaskan Indians of Mentasta Village to continue subsistence fishing at Batzulnetas as they and their ancestors have done since time immemorial.[1] The fishery at Batzulnetas lies near the confluence of Tanada Creek and the Copper River and within Wrangell-St. Elias National Park. They also involve the claim by the state of Alaska that the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, on behalf of the federal government, are attempting to exercise too much control over fish and wildlife management within the state.

The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA), 16 U.S.C. § 3101 et seq., requires that subsistence fishing and hunting be given a priority over other uses of fish and wildlife on "public lands." The sole issue remaining in this appeal concerns the meaning of the definition of public lands in § 102 of ANILCA. 16 U.S.C. § 3102.[2] Specifically, the parties

---

[1] The following amici curiae also seek to continue subsistence fishing in particular navigable waters: the Peratrovich Plaintiffs whose ancestors fished in marine waters in the Alexander Archipelago and within the Tongass National Forest; the Tlingit, Haida and Tsimshian Indians of the Sitka Tribe whose ancestors also fished in marine waters; the Yup'ik Eskimos of the Villages of Quinhagak and Goodnews Bay whose ancestors fished at the mouths of the Kanektok and Goodnews Rivers; and the Native Alaskans of the Village of Elim and the Nome Eskimo Community whose ancestors fished along the coast of the Seward Peninsula in northern Norton Sound.

[2] Another issue originally raised in this appeal was whether Title VIII of ANILCA authorizes the federal government to manage subsistence fishing and hunting on public lands in the absence of Alaska laws implementing the subsistence priority. The district court held that ANILCA does, in fact, authorize the appropriate federal agencies to promulgate regulations if the state does not or cannot do so. After briefing was completed in this court, but before oral argument, the parties, including, the state of Alaska, stipulated to the dismissal with prejudice of that issue. We accepted the stipulation. The Alaska Legislature, angry with the Governor's directive to the Attorney General to stipulate to the dismissal, filed an emergency motion for interven-

dispute whether navigable waters fall within the statutory definition of public lands and are thus subject to federal management to implement ANILCA's subsistence priority.[3]

The district court adopted a highly expansive definition of public lands, holding that the subsistence priority applies to all Alaskan waters subject to the federal navigational servitude. We disagree. Instead, we hold that the subsistence priority applies to navigable waters in which the United States has reserved water rights. We hold also that the federal agencies that administer the subsistence priority are responsible for identifying those waters. We therefore reverse and remand to the district court for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

I. BACKGROUND

In 1958, Congress preserved aboriginal fishing rights in the Statehood Act. Act of July 7, 1958, Pub. L. 85-508, § 4, 72 Stat. 339. But in 1960, after assuming responsibility for fish and wildlife management, the state closed the fishery at Batzulnetas and other traditional subsistence fisheries. In 1971, Congress extinguished aboriginal fishing rights. 43 U.S.C. § 1603(b).

Congress expected that the state and the federal agencies would protect subsistence hunting and fishing. 1971 U.S.C.C.A.N. 2247, 2250. In 1980, frustrated with their failure to do so, Congress enacted ANILCA. Title VIII of ANILCA required that rural Alaska residents be accorded a priority for subsistence hunting and fishing on public lands. 16 U.S.C. §§ 3113, 3114. Pursuant to § 805(d) of ANILCA, 16 U.S.C.

---

tion and, in the alternative, for substitution, or for stay. We denied its motion, concluding that the Legislature was not empowered under state law to intervene in the appeal. In light of the dismissal with prejudice of that issue, the district court's holding on this issue stands.

[3] As the parties do not dispute whether nonnavigable waters are public lands, we do not address that issue.

§ 3115(d), Congress gave the state authority to implement the rural subsistence preference by enacting laws of general applicability consistent with ANILCA's operative provisions. In anticipation of ANILCA's passage, the state enacted laws consistent with Title VIII which gave rural residents a subsistence priority. In 1982, after Congress enacted ANILCA, the Secretary of the Interior certified the state to manage subsistence hunting, and fishing on public lands.

*2 Congress could not have anticipated the next chain of events. In 1989, the Alaska Supreme Court struck down the state act granting the rural subsistence preference as contrary to the Alaska state constitution. McDowell v. Alaska, 785 P.2d 1 (Alaska 1989). It stayed its decision to give the legislature an opportunity to amend the constitution or otherwise bring its program into compliance with ANILCA. The legislature, however, failed to act during either its regular or special session.

In 1990, the federal government withdrew Alaska's certification and took over implementation of Title VIII. The Secretary of the Interior, on behalf of all concerned federal agencies, published temporary subsistence management regulations which adopted a very narrow definition of public lands, explaining that "navigable waters generally are not included within the definition of public lands." 55 Fed. Reg. 27,114, at 27,115 (June 29, 1990). The final regulations did not differ significantly. See 57 Fed. Reg. 22,940, at 22,942 (May 29, 1992).

Katie John and the state brought separate actions against the federal agencies; Katie John challenged the regulations that provided that public lands excluded navigable waters and the state challenged the federal government's authority to regulate in this area at all. The district court ordered these actions consolidated and that other actions raising similar issues be jointly managed.[4] After consulting with counsel for the parties

[4] The jointly managed cases include: Kluti Kaah Native Village of Copper Ctr. v. Alaska, No. A90-0004-CV, Fish & Game Fund v. Alaska Bd.

in the jointly managed cases, the district court decided to address the fundamental issue of whether navigable waters are public lands before resolving other issues.[5]

Katie John argued that public lands include virtually all navigable waters, by virtue of the federal navigational servitude. The state contended that public lands exclude navigable waters. Prior to oral argument before the district court, the federal agencies agreed with the state. But at oral argument, those agencies modified their position, arguing that public lands include those navigable waters in which the federal government has an interest under the reserved water rights doctrine.

On cross-motions for summary judgment, the district court concluded that public lands include all navigable waters encompassed by the navigational servitude. Subsequently, the district court stayed its decision and certified the issue of whether public lands include navigable waters for interlocutory appeal.[6] Both the state and the federal agencies appeal.

II. ANALYSIS

We consider two questions when we review an agency's construction of a statute that it administers. Chevron U.S.A. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, 467 U.S. 837, 842 (1984). First, we consider "whether Congress 'has directly spoken to the precise question at issue' either in the statute itself or in the

---

of Fisheries, No. A92-0443-CV, Peratrovich v. United States, No. A92-0734-CV, Native Village of Stevens v. McVee, No. A92-0567-CV, and Native Village of Quinhagak v. United States, No. A93-0023-CV.

[5] The district court also characterized as fundamental the issue of whether ANILCA authorizes federal agencies to manage subsistence fishing and hunting on public lands in the absence of consistent Alaska laws. As discussed supra at note 2, that issue is not before us.

[6] Similarly, it certified the issue of whether ANILCA authorizes federal agencies to manage subsistence fishing and hunting on public lands in the absence of consistent Alaska laws for interlocutory appeal. But see supra at note 2.

legislative history." Railway Labor Executives' Ass'n v. ICC, 784 F.2d 959, 963 (9th Cir. 1986) (quoting Chevron, 467 U.S. at 842). Second, if Congress has not directly spoken to that precise question, we consider "whether the agency's answer is based on a permissible construction of the statute." *Chevron*, 467 U.S. at 843).

*3 Under ANILCA, "the term 'public lands' means land situated in Alaska which . . . are Federal lands." 16 U.S.C. § 3102(3). "The term 'Federal land' means lands the title to which is in the United States." 16 U.S.C. § 3102(2). And "[t]he term 'land' means lands, waters, and interests therein." 16 U.S.C. § 3102(1). In other words, public lands are lands, waters, and interests therein, the title to which is in the United States. Amoco Production Co. v. Village of Gambell, 480 U.S. 531, 548 n.15 (1987).

As noted above, the parties dispute whether navigable waters are public lands. At one extreme, the state maintains that ANILCA's definition of public lands excludes all navigable waters because the federal government does not hold title to them by virtue of the navigational servitude or the reserved water rights doctrine. At the other extreme are Katie John and amici curiae Peratrovich Plaintiffs who argue that all navigable waters are public lands. Katie John says this is so because the navigational servitude defines the scope of public lands. The Peratrovich Plaintiffs say this is so because, in ANILCA, Congress expressed its intent to exercise its Commerce Clause powers to regulate subsistence fishing in navigable waters.[7] In the middle are federal agencies contending that public lands include certain navigable waters, defined by the reserved water rights doctrine.[8]

---

[7] In addition to their Commerce Clause argument, amici curiae Peratrovich Plaintiffs join in Katie John's navigational servitude argument.

[8] In addition to their navigational servitude and Commerce Clause arguments, Katie John and amici curiae Peratrovich Plaintiffs alternatively contend that the reserved water rights doctrine defines the scope of public lands.

ANILCA's language and legislative history indicate clearly that Congress spoke to the precise question of whether some navigable waters may be public lands. They clearly indicate that subsistence uses include subsistence fishing. See, e.g., 16 U.S.C. § 3113. And subsistence fishing has traditionally taken place in navigable waters. Thus, we have no doubt that Congress intended that public lands include at least some navigable waters.[9]

Unfortunately, ANILCA's language and legislative history do not give us the clear direction necessary to find that Congress spoke to the precise question of which navigable waters are public lands. ANILCA itself refers only to "lands, waters, and interests therein, the title to which is in the United States." It makes no reference to navigable waters. The legislative history is also unhelpful, containing only a single reference to navigable waters. See 126 Cong. Rec. 20278-80 (Nov. 12, 1980) (statement of Rep. Udall). Lacking clear direction, we must decide whether the federal agencies' conclusion that public lands include some navigable waters under the reserved water rights doctrine is based on a permissible construction of the statute.

A. Navigational Servitude

The navigational servitude describes the paramount interest of the United States in navigation and the navigable waters of the nation. United States v. Certain Parcels of Land, 666 F.2d 1236, 1238 (9th Cir. 1982). It derives from the Commerce Clause. Kaiser Aetna v. United States, 444 U.S. 164, 177 (1979). It is "a concept of power, not of property." Certain Parcels, 666 F.2d at 1238 (citing United States v. Twin City Power Co., 350 U.S. 222, 224-25 (1956)).

---

[9] Our interpretation of the term public lands in this case will not allow the United States to usurp state power over navigable waters elsewhere. ANILCA applies only to Alaska and our interpretation of its definition of public lands is necessary to give meaning to its purpose of providing an opportunity for a subsistence way of life.

*4 We have held that the navigational servitude is not "public land" within the meaning of ANILCA because the United States does not hold title to it. City of Angoon v. Hodel, 803 F.2d 1016, 1027 n.6 (9th Cir. 1986), cert. denied, 484 U.S. 870 (1987). Contrary to the district court's opinion, the Supreme Court has not limited that holding. In Amoco Production Co. v. Village of Gambell, 480 U.S. 531 (1987), the Court rejected the assertion that the Outer Continental Shelf (0CS) is not "Federal land" because the United States does not hold title to it. Id. at 548 n.15. The Court explained in dictum that, while the United States may not hold "title" to the OCS, it was hesitant to conclude that the United States did not have "title" to "any interests therein." Id. But its dictum indicates only that, while the United States may not hold title to land, it may hold title to interests (e.g., mineral rights) in that land.

For this reason, we reject the argument that the navigational servitude is an "interest ... the title to which is in the United States," such that all navigable waters are public lands within the meaning of ANILCA.

B. Commerce Clause

Neither the language nor the legislative history of ANILCA suggests that Congress intended to exercise its Commerce Clause powers over submerged lands and navigable Alaska waters. Although Congress explicitly invoked its authority under the Commerce Clause to protect and provide the opportunity for continued subsistence uses on the public lands, see 16 U.S.C. § 3111(4), its invocation of that authority is also consistent with an implicit reservation of waters under the reserved water rights doctrine.

Congressman Morris Udall inserted a statement in the Congressional Record that ANILCA's definition of public lands included all navigable waters throughout Alaska. See 126 Cong. Rec. 29260, 20278-80 (Nov. 12, 1980) (statement of Rep. Udall). He did so, however, after the Senate had passed

ANILCA, after the House had finished debating it, and shortly before the House voted on it. His views deserve little weight. See NLRB v. Fruit & Vegetable Packers & Warehouseman, 377 U.S. 58, 66 (1964) ("these statements could represent only the personal views of these legislators, since [they] were inserted in the Congressional Record after passage of the Act").

We reject the argument that Congress expressed its intent to exercise its Commerce Clause powers to regulate subsistence fishing in all Alaskan navigable waters.

C. Reserved Water Rights

Under the reserved water rights doctrine, when the United States withdraws its lands from the public domain and reserves them for a federal purpose, the United States implicitly reserves appurtenant waters then unappropriated to the extent needed to accomplish the purpose of the reservation. Cappaert v. United States, 426 U.S. 128, 138 (1976). The United States may reserve "only that amount of water necessary to fulfill the purpose of the reservation." Id. at 141. The United States' authority to reserve unappropriated waters derives from the Commerce Clause and the Property Clause. Id. at 138.

*5 In determining whether the reserved water rights doctrine applies, we must determine whether the United States intended to reserve unappropriated waters. Id. at 139. Intent is inferred if those waters are necessary to accomplish the purposes for which the land was reserved. Id.; United States v. New Mexico, 438 U.S. 696, 702 (1978). It follows that courts must conclude that "without the water the purposes of the reservation would be entirely defeated." Id. at 700.

The United States has reserved vast parcels of land in Alaska for federal purposes through a myriad of statutes.[10] In

---

[10] These statutes include, but are not limited to, acts reserving land for national parks, forests and wildlife preserves, the Statehood Act, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act and ANILCA itself.

doing so, it has also implicitly reserved appurtenant waters, including appurtenant navigable waters, to the extent needed to accomplish the purposes of the reservations. By virtue of its reserved water rights, the United States has interests in some navigable waters. Consequently, public lands subject to subsistence management under ANILCA include certain navigable waters.

For these reasons, we hold that the federal agencies' conclusion, that the definition of public lands includes those navigable waters in which the United States has an interest by virtue of the reserved water rights doctrine, is reasonable. We also hold that the federal agencies that administer the subsistence priority are responsible for identifying those waters.

III. CONCLUSION

We recognize that our holding may be inherently unsatisfactory. By holding that public lands include some specific navigable waters as a result of reserved water rights, we impose an extraordinary administrative burden on federal agencies. We accept a complicated regulatory scheme requiring federal and state management of navigable waters. Let us hope that the federal agencies will determine promptly which navigable waters are public lands subject to federal subsistence management. As long as federal and state regulation is necessary, we expect the federal agencies and the state to cooperate fully to protect and provide the opportunity for subsistence fishing in navigable waters.

If we were to adopt the state's position, that public lands exclude navigable waters, we would give meaning to the term "title" in the definition of the phrase "public lands." But we would undermine congressional intent to protect and provide the opportunity for subsistence fishing.

If we were to adopt Katie John's position, that public lands include all navigable waters, we would give federal agencies

control over all such waters in Alaska. ANILCA does not support such a complete assertion of federal control and the federal agencies do not ask to have that control.

The issue raised by the parties cries out for a legislative, not a judicial, solution. If the Alaska Legislature were to amend the state constitution or otherwise comply with ANILCA's rural subsistence priority, the state could resume management of subsistence uses on public lands including navigable waters. Neither the heavy administrative burden nor the complicated regulatory scheme that may result from our decision would be necessary. If Congress were to amend ANILCA, it could clarify both the definition of public lands and its intent. Only legislative action by Alaska or Congress will truly resolve the problem.

***6 REVERSED and REMANDED.**

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE

Official Business

State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

Jan. 24. 1995

Gov. Tony Knowles
Office of the Governor
State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska

Dear Governor Knowles:

The leadership of the House and Senate were extremely disappointed to learn of your intention to withdraw the State of Alaska from its appeal in the *State of Alaska v. Babbitt* case now before the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals.

We believe that this decision greatly undermines the position of the State. Why withdraw from this part of the case at this juncture? All of the work has been completed except for the oral arguments before the Court scheduled for Feb. 8.

Members of both the Senate and House majorities respectfully request that you reconsider. The future of our state's management authority is at state and we should pursue all avenues to protect our statehood rights.

Sincerely,

/s/
Drue Pearce
Gail Phillips

/s/
Gail Phillips
Speaker of the House

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE

Official Business

State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

January 25, 1995

Clerk of the Court
U.S. Court of Appeals
for the Ninth Circuit
121 Spear Street
San Francisco, California 94105

Re: State v. Babbitt, No. 94-3480

On behalf of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, we, the undersigned, request that this Court reject the State's Stipulation of Dismissal With Prejudice in the above captioned matter. For his own reasons, Governor Tony Knowles and his administration are unwilling to continue the appeal in its entirety.

This issue Governor Knowles is seeking to dismiss, whether the United States Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture have the authority to assume management of fish and wildlife for subsistence purposes on public lands in the State of Alaska, is extremely important. If dismissed, the District Court opinion upsets the balance of federal and state power as set forth in the Alaska Statehood Compact and infringes upon the sovereignty of the state of Alaska.

The legislature of the State of Alaska is an interested party in this matter and is in the process of preparing a motion to intervene with supporting memoranda.

The legislature of the State of Alaska has retained the law firm of Mudge, Rose, Guthrie, Alexander & Ferdon to represent it in this matter.

Respectfully,

/s/

Drue Pearce,
President of the Senate

/s/

Gail Phillips,
Speaker of the House

/s/

Senator Steve Frank

/s/

Representative Alan Austeman

/s/

Senator Lyda Green

/s/

Representative Ramona Barnes

/s/

Senator Rick Halford

/s/

Representative Con Bunde

/s/

Senator Tim Kelly

/s/

Representative Gary Davis

/s/

Senator Loren Leman

/s/

Representative

/s/

Senator Mike Miller

/s/

Representative Joe Green

/s/

Senator Randy Phillips

/s/

Senator Steve Rieger

/s/

Senator Bert Sharp

/s/

Senator Robin Taylor

/s/

Senator John Torgerson

/s/

Representative Carl Moses

/s/

Representative Elden Mulder

/s/

Representative
Norman Rokeberg

/s/

Representative
Mark Hanley

/s/

Representative
Jeannette James

/s/

Representative Pete Kelly

/s/

Representative Vic Kohring

/s/

Representative Pete Kott

/s/

Representative Terry Martin

/s/

Representative
Beverly Masek

/s/

Representative Scott Ogan

/s/

Representative Jerry Sanders

/s/

Representative Sean Parnell

/s/

Representative Gene Therriault

/s/

Representative Brian Porter

/s/

Representative Cynthia Toohey

/s/

Representative Al Vezey

9-LS0548\A

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 6

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA
NINETEENTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

By SENATORS PEARCE, Frank, Green, Halford, Kelly, Leman, Miller, Phillips, Rieger, Sharp, Taylor, Torgerson

REPRESENTATIVES Bunde, Toohey, Green

Introduced: 1/25/95
Held on the Secretary's Desk

A RESOLUTION

Strongly urging the Governor to continue the lawsuit known as State of Alaska v. Babbitt, C.A. No. 94-35480, and to pursue the State of Alaska's position that the United States Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture do not have the authority to assume management of fish and wildlife on public land in the State of Alaska.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

WHEREAS Tony Knowles, Governor of the State of Alaska, seeks to withdraw, with prejudice, from the consideration of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in State of Alaska v. Babbitt, C.A. No. 94-35480, the issue of whether the United States Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture have the authority to assume management of fish and wildlife for subsistence purposes, or any other purposes, on public land in the State of Alaska; and

WHEREAS the United States Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture do not have, under the Alaska Statehood Act, the authority to assume management of fish and wildlife on public land in the State of Alaska, nor has the United

States Congress or the Alaska State Legislature specifically authorized any modification to existing management authority over fish and wildlife; and

WHEREAS the State of Alaska was admitted into the Union on January 3, 1959, under the Alaska Statehood Act, that incorporated the Alaska Statehood Compact, approved by the citizens of the Territory of Alaska; and

WHEREAS the Alaska Statehood Compact sets out the rights and obligations of the State of Alaska and is a contract between two sovereigns that, by its terms, may not be unilaterally altered by either party; and

WHEREAS under the Alaska Statehood Compact, the State of Alaska, not the federal government, has the authority to administer and manage the fish and wildlife resources of Alaska; and

WHEREAS because the Alaska Statehood Compact is a contract between the citizens of the State of Alaska and the United States, only the Alaska State Legislature, as the people's representative, has the legal authority to agree to alter the terms of the Alaska Statehood Compact; and

WHEREAS the Alaska State Legislature believes Governor Knowles' withdrawal of this issue from consideration will adversely affect the sovereignty of the State of Alaska and the delicate balance of federal and state power agreed upon in the Alaska Statehood Compact; and

WHEREAS the United States District Court judge specifically recognized both the merits of the claims of the State of Alaska on the management issue and the need to have his decision reviewed by the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit; and

WHEREAS the Alaska State Legislature believes Governor Knowles' withdrawal of this issue from consideration will result in the federal usurpation of the State of Alaska's ability

to govern the management of fish and wildlife on public land in its territory in violation of the Alaska Statehood Compact; and

WHEREAS the Alaska State Legislature believes Governor Knowles' refusal to advocate this issue constitutes a failure to defend the Constitution of the State of Alaska that protects the rights and benefits of all of the citizens of the State of Alaska equally;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Alaska State Legislature exhorts Governor Knowles to continue to advocate this issue before the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED that, if Governor Knowles declines to continue defending the right of the State of Alaska to govern the management of fish and wildlife on public land in its territory as well as the protections afforded by the Constitution of the State of Alaska, the Alaska State Legislature will intervene as a representative of the citizens of the State of Alaska to continue the lawsuit and advocate the position that the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture do not have the authority to assume management of fish and wildlife on public land in the State of Alaska.

PASSED BY THE SENATE January 26, 1995

/s/
Drue Pearce
President of the Senate

ATTEST:

/s/
Nancy Quinto
Secretary of the Senate

PASSED BY THE HOUSE January 30, 1995

/s/
Gail Phillips
Speaker of the House

ATTEST:

/s/
Suzi Lowell
Chief Clerk of the House

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE III

Section 2. The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority; — to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls; — to all Cases of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction; — to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party; — to Controversies between two or more States; — between a State and Citizens of another State; — between citizens of different States; — between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens therefor, and foreign States, Citizens or Subjects.[1]

In all Cases affecting Ambassadors other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other Cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make. . . .

---

[1] This section has been affected by the Eleventh Amendment.

ALASKA STATEHOOD ACT AND COMPACT

Act of July 7, 1958

Pub. L. 85-508, 72 Stat. 339 (1958)

. . .

(e) All real and personal property of the United States situated in the Territory of Alaska which is specifically used for the sole purpose of conservation and protection of the fisheries and wildlife of Alaska, . . . shall be transferred and conveyed to the State of Alaska by the appropriate Federal agency: *Provided,* That the administration and management of the fish and wildlife resources of Alaska shall be retained by the Federal Government under existing laws until the first day of the first calendar year following the expiration of ninety legislative days after the Secretary of the Interior certifies to the Congress that the Alaska State Legislature has made adequate provision for the administration, management, and conservation of said resources in the broad national interest ...

ALASKA NATIONAL INTEREST LANDS CONSERVATION ACT ("ANILCA")

Pub. L. No. 96-487, 94 Stat., 2374 (1980)

16 U.S.C. § 3101 *et seq.*

. . .

ANILCA, Section 102
16 U.S.C. Section 3102. Definitions

As used in this Act . . .

(3) The term "public lands" means land situated in Alaska which, after December 2, 1980, are Federal lands, except — . . .

. . .

ANILCA, Title VIII (Rural Subsistence Preference)

16 U.S.C. Section 3113. Definitions

As used in this Act, the term "subsistence uses" means the customary and traditional uses by rural Alaska residents of wild, renewable resources for direct personal or family consumption as food, shelter, fuel, clothing, tools, or transportation; for the making and selling of handicraft articles out of nonedible byproducts of fish and wildlife resources taken for personal or family consumption; for barter, or sharing for personal or family consumption; and for customary trade. . . .

16 U.S.C. Section 3114. Preference for subsistence uses

Except as otherwise provided in this Act and other Federal laws, the taking on public lands of fish and wildlife for nonwasteful subsistence uses shall be accorded priority over the taking on such lands of fish and wildlife for other purposes.

Whenever it is necessary to restrict the taking of populations of fish and wildlife on such lands for subsistence uses in order to protect the continued viability of such populations, or to continue such uses, such priority shall be implemented through appropriate limitations based on the application of the following criteria:

(1) customary and direct dependence upon the populations as the mainstay of livelihood;

(2) local residency; and

(3) the availability of alternative resources.

. . .

ANILCA, Section 1314
16 U.S.C. Section 3202. Taking of fish and wildlife

(a) Responsibility and authority of the State of Alaska

Nothing in this Act is intended to enlarge or diminish the responsibility and authority of the State of Alaska for management of fish and wildlife on the public lands except as may be provided in subchapter II of this chapter or to amend the Alaska constitution.

(b) Responsibility and authority of Secretary

Except as specifically provided otherwise by this Act, nothing in this Act is intended to enlarge or diminish the responsibility and authority of the Secretary over the management of the public lands.

. . .

SUBSISTENCE MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS FOR PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA

Subparts A, B, and C

57 Fed. Reg. 22940 (May 29, 1992)

. . .

SUMMARY

This rule promulgates regulations governing administration of subsistence taking of fish and wildlife on public lands in Alaska. This rule implements the subsistence priority for rural Alaska residents under Title VIII of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA). It replaces the Temporary Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska, which expire on June 30, 1992.

. . .

BACKGROUND

Title VIII of ANILCA (16 U.S.C. 3111-3126) requires the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture (Secretaries) to implement a joint Federal Subsistence Management Program (FSMP) to grant a priority for subsistence uses of fish and wildlife resources on public lands in Alaska, unless the State of Alaska enacts and implements laws of general applicability consistent with sections 803, 804, and 805 of ANILCA. To be consistent with sections 803, 804, and 805 of ANILCA, the State's laws of general applicability must confine the preference for subsistence uses to those subsistence uses engaged in by rural Alaska residents. Until recently, the State managed the subsistence program on public lands pursuant to section 805 of ANILCA. In December 1989, the Alaska Supreme Court ruled in *McDowell v. State of Alaska* that the rural preference found in the State subsistence statute violated the Alaska Constitution. The effect of this ruling required the State

to delete the rural preference from its subsistence statute, and therefore, the State subsistence statute failed to comply with Title VIII of ANILCA. The Court stayed the effect of the *McDowell* decision until July 1, 1990.

Consequently, the Secretaries assumed responsibility for the implementation of Title VIII of ANILCA on July 1, 1990.

. . .

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

. . .

ARTICLE III

Section 16. Governor's Authority

The governor shall be responsible for the faithful execution of the laws. He may, by appropriate court action or proceeding brought in the name of the State, enforce compliance with any constitutional or legislative mandate, or restrain violation of any constitutional or legislative power, duty, or right by any officer, department, or agency of the State or any of its political subdivisions. This authority shall not be construed to authorize any action or proceeding against the legislature.

. . .

ARTICLE VIII

Section 1. Statement of Policy

It is the policy of the State to encourage the settlement of its land and the development of its resources by making them available for maximum use consistent with the public interest.

Section 2. General Authority

The legislature shall provide for the utilization, development, and conservation of all natural resources belonging to the State, including land and waters, for the maximum benefit of its people.

. . .

Section 5. Facilities and Improvements

The legislature may provide for facilities, improvements, and services to assure greater utilization, development, reclamation, and settlement of lands, and to assure fuller utilization and development of the fisheries, wildlife, and waters.

Section 6. State Public Domain

Lands and interests therein, including submerged and tidal lands, possessed or acquired by the State, and not used or intended exclusively for governmental purposes, constitute the state public domain. The legislature shall provide for the selection of lands granted to the State by the United States, and for the administration of the state public domain.

. . .

Section 8. Leases

The legislature may provide for the leasing of, and the issuance of permits for exploration of, any part of the public domain or interest therein, subject to reasonably concurrent uses. Leases and permits shall provide, among other conditions, for payment by the party at fault for damage or injury arising from noncompliance with terms governing concurrent use, and for forfeiture in the event of breach of conditions.

Section 9. Sales and Grants

Subject to the provisions of this section, the legislature may provide for the sale or grant of state lands, or interests therein, and establish sales procedures. All sales or grants shall contain such reservations to the State of all resources as may be required by Congress or the State and shall provide for access to these resources. Reservation of access shall not unnecessarily impair the owners' use, prevent the control of trespass, or preclude compensation for damages.

. . .

Section 12. Mineral Leases and Permits

The legislature shall provide for the issuance, types and terms of leases for coal, oil, gas, oil shale, sodium, phosphate, potash, sulfur, pumice, and other minerals as may be prescribed by law. Leases and permits giving the exclusive right of exploration for these minerals for specific periods and areas, subject to reasonable concurrent exploration as to different classes of minerals, may be authorized by law. Like leases and permits giving the exclusive right of prospected by geophysical, geochemical, and similar methods for all minerals may also be authorized by law.

. . .

Section 14. Access to Navigable Waters

Free access to the navigable or public waters of the State, as defined by the legislature, shall not be denied any citizen of the United States or resident of the State, except that the legislature may by general law regulate and limit such access for other beneficial uses or public purposes.

Section 15. No Exclusive Right of Fishery

No exclusive right or special privilege of fishery shall be created or authorized in the natural waters of the State. This section does not restrict the power of the State to limit entry into fishery for purposes of resource conservation, to prevent economic distress among fishermen and those dependent upon them for a livelihood and to promote the efficient development of aquaculture in the State.

Section 16. Protection of Rights

No person shall be involuntarily divested of his right to the use of waters, his interests in lands, or improvements affecting either, except for a superior beneficial use or public purpose and then only with just compensation and by operation of law.

Section 17. Uniform Application

Laws and regulations governing the use or disposal of natural resources shall apply equally to all persons similarly situated with reference to the subject matter and purpose to be served by the law or regulation.

. . .

ALASKA STATUTES

SECTION 24.20.060

The legislative council has the power

. . .

(E) to do all things necessary to carry out legislative directives and law, and the duties set out in the uniform rules of the legislature;

(F) to sue in the name of the legislature during the interim between sessions if authorized by majority vote of the full membership of the council;

. . .